P
Relig
M.
X
901
6
11
0.11

Vol. XI., No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1922.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

LIBRARY
JUL 23 1924
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

CONTENTS

Signs of the Times: PAGE
A Recent Charge of Heresy 557
Professor Headlam and the Cambridge Conference 559
Dr. Temple's Modernist Kindergarten 561
The Ninth Conference of Modern Churchmen .. 564
The Ethics of Religious Conformity 565
Harold Anson, M.A.
Some Modern Problems of the Mission Field .. 577
I. The Relation of Christianity to Other Religions
E. C. Dewick, M.A.
The Messianic Hope 587
B. H. Streeter, D.D.
Modernism and Authority 596
Francis E. Powell, M.A.
Book Notices:
A Jesuit on Reunion 602
A Statesman Bishop 606
Hellenism and Christianity 608
Sin and Psychology 610
A Practical Guide to Church Law 611
Correspondence:
Reunion and Primitive Christianity 612

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: AMERICA—C. H. DANIELS, 49 West 55th Street, New York, U.S.A.
SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
AUSTRALIA—A. McCUBBIN & Co., 152 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 102 Wakefield Street, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Miss E. M. ALLEN, M.A.
Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Rev. C. BASS, M.A.
Right Rev. A. HAMILTON BAYNES, D.D.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Rev. W. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBS.
Principal F. B. JEVONS, Litt.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt.
Miss D. NUSSEY.
Rev. C. E. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Principal Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—MISS DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—ROBERT WARNER, Esq., F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Street Chambers, E.C.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10.

Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent **free** to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1922. Vol. XI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

A Recent Charge of Heresy.

In a crowded railway carriage the late Professor Mahaffy was once asked by an earnest Evangelist: 'Are you saved?' The Professor leant forward towards his interlocutor and replied in serious tones: 'Yes, I am saved, but it was a near squeak, and I don't like to talk about it.'

We feel like the Professor, though we can scarcely pretend that ours was 'a near squeak.' But unhappily such reticence is denied to the writer of editorial notes, and we are therefore compelled to comment, albeit briefly, on a recent charge of heresy, in its non-personal aspect.

There is no need to give particulars of the charge or of its dismissal by the Bishop of Oxford and the Primate. The ecclesiastical and secular press have furnished the public with accounts 'of all, and more than all, that is known to men' of the origin, progress, and termination of the affair. It only remains for us to point a moral and adorn a tale.

In a world which is by no means convinced that there is a future life, a dispute about the *mode* of the resurrection may well seem futile, but the dispute involved much more than the obvious issue. The historian Gibbon saw in the conflict between Arius and Athanasius nothing more than a wrangle about an iota. But as Aristotle acutely observes, although men dispute about small points, the reasons for their difference are not small. Nor were the reasons for difference small in this case. Behind the disputants, Traditionalism and Modernism were facing each other.

The real point at issue in the recent 'heresy case' was trenchantly stated by the Editor of the *Challenge* in his leader of January 20th:

> The charge and the Bishop of Oxford's decision have become events of supreme importance, and establish a precedent of wide significance in the struggle between Traditionalists and Liberals. For ever since the Anglo-Catholics accepted Mr. N. P. Williams' definition of the vague phrase 'primitive Christendom' as equivalent to 'undivided pre-1054 Christendom' and sought to impose the authority of the undivided Church upon us all, it has been evident that sooner or later a test case must arise to decide whether the far-reaching changes and restatements, which the progress of human knowledge had made necessary, involved their supporters in heresy. We could have wished for no clearer test than this which Mr. Douglas has so ill-advisedly elected to impose. It has been imposed: and the verdict has upset the whole Anglo-Catholic position.

Such a consequence will come as no surprise to those who have grasped the fact of evolution in human history, and believe that there is a Spirit of Truth which is guiding the Christian Church, or at least that part of it which is loyal to Christ, into all truth.

The 'heresy case' has also served to bring into prominence the soundness of the Church policy which has been constantly advocated by Modernists—that of distinguishing the great affirmations of faith or fact in the Christian religion from the *modes* in which we think of them and confess them. The modes concerned will change with changing philosophies and new interpretations of history, but the essentials themselves will lose neither their reality nor their values. The recognition of this principle by the Church authorities, and a policy based upon it, would do much to set our jarring discords at rest. It would secure greater freedom for the Church's teachers and thinkers, and provide a more influential and interesting pulpit. Moreover, by taking the pressure off theological and historical differences, the clergy would be liberated to give themselves more freely to the solving of various pressing problems connected with social righteousness, national education, and public morals, which at present are vexing the minds of all those who desire the enduring welfare of mankind.

When we return to the Gospel of the Kingdom we find much emphasis there on personal faith, loyal obedience, persevering prayer, a loving, peaceful, unworldly spirit; but no emphasis at all upon those ecclesiastical questions which are at present troubling our much vexed Church and our overworked bishops.

Professor Headlam and the Cambridge Conference.

Professor Headlam, who unites practicality of mind with a high degree of moral courage, has been dealing in the current issue of the *Church Quarterly Review* with the Cambridge Conference and its critics.

Of the general tone of the conference he writes:

> 'We are clearly face to face with a body of sincere men, profoundly convinced of the truth of the Christian Revelation, anxious to commend it to the world, feeling that it is their duty to be quite certain what is true before they teach.'

He recognizes its underlying motive: that without being apologetic in manner, it was apologetic in aim: that it strove to be constructive, not destructive: positive, not negative. The Conference leaders felt, as he says, that:

> 'The traditional belief about the Person of Christ . . . ought to be re-stated in a way which will free it from . . . serious objections, and that it is worth much trouble to attempt to do that and thus commend the Faith of Christ, about which none of the writers have any doubt, to the people of this country.'

At the same time, Dr. Headlam does not hold that the Conference was successful in achieving its aim. He writes:

> 'We do not doubt that everything that is written or was said at the conference was inspired by real religious belief; we do not doubt that the holders of the belief can feel that they can quite consistently use the Christian creeds and interpret the Christian Scriptures; but we do not really think that they have given us anything which is in any way more adapted to the modern or the religious mind. It is a theory which will not bear them out. It is not ultimately self-consistent, and it could not form the basis of real religious teaching.'

We cannot agree with the last three statements. A changing humanity needs a changing Christology, although Jesus Christ be the same 'yesterday, to-day and for ever.' Only experience will prove whether Dr. Headlam or the Girton theologians have the future with them. Meanwhile, the failure of the traditional Christology to grip the younger generation to-day does suggest the need for restatement. It is not necessary that 'the Christ that is to be,' to use Tennyson's phrase, should appeal to the older generation.

Dr. Headlam deals severely with the 'heresy hunting' tactics of those who attacked and misrepresented the teaching of the conference papers. The agitation against the Cambridge Conference, Dr. Headlam points out, resulted in a sale of the September issue of the *Modern Churchman*

> 'probably quite unique for a serious theological work at the present day.'

This is true. Moreover, although claiming to be actuated by a desire to protect the tender consciences of those injured by the conference statements, the heresy-hunters managed to effect what they set out to prevent. Dr. Headlam writes:

> 'Do they realize that it is just the agitation which has alarmed the tender consciences?'

That is undoubtedly the case, but we really doubt whether the alarm does much real harm. Christian faith is not so frail and delicate a thing as is often assumed. Sin and sloth can kill it, but doubts suggested by unbelievers or misbelievers have extraordinarily little effect on a faith which is based on religious experience. Moreover, it is not the statements of Modernists, but the ineffective way in which the Christian religion is presented by Traditionalists which is the true cause of much unbelief. The wide-spread scepticism in France, notwithstanding the piety and energy of the French priesthood, is not due to Modernism. The religious situation in Italy, Spain and South America is not a consequence of the advocacy of Modernism from the pulpits of the churches of those lands.

Dr. Headlam's criticism of 'these severe critics of Modernism' appears to us so necessary, if the spread of a fanatical and obscurantist zeal is to be controlled, that we cannot forbear citing it at length. He writes:

> 'They seem to be entirely oblivious of the world in which they live. They write and speak as if the only thing necessary to recommend the Christian Faith to the vast mass of people in this country is to assert it in as hard, as dogmatic, and as uncompromising a form as is possible, and that then everyone would flock to hear it. They seem to know nothing of the difficulties of intellectual men which have spread so far afield owing to the widespread influence of journalism. They seem to know nothing of the criticisms which have been put forward on the side of natural science or philosophy. They know nothing of the earnest and anxious questionings of sincere and good men in what way the Christian Revelation is true. They seem oblivious also of the fact that the presentation of the Christian message, as they would put it forward, may not be for the present day an adequate or convincing presentation of that message. They confuse their own particular point of view with the Christian point of view. To earnest men who are considering carefully how they may present the message so as to bring its truth home to the great body of the people, who examine carefully to see whether their own view of it is correct or not, who are approaching the subject with thoughtfulness and sincerity, they have nothing to give but indiscriminate and arrogant invective. They are prepared on the slighest provocation and on no adequate cause to bring accusations of heresy, and like many of the would-be-ultra-orthodox in the past are often really heretical themselves.

> 'Surely they might take warning by the past history of the Christian faith. They might learn how much evil has been done by fierce and violent controversy stirred up without any adequate occasion . . . Are they quite sure that they are any wiser than the Roman Church of the present day which refuses to make any compromise with criticism, and checks and restrains freedom of thought in the way which Cardinal Newman complained of so bitterly? To us it seems that these people who are so ready to bring accusations of heresy, and who make their attacks often so violently and without taking the trouble to become acquainted with the real meaning of what they are attacking, are doing very great disservice to the cause of Christianity. As will become apparent, we do not agree with much of the Modernist contention, but it must be recognised that the difficulties are great, and that they should be solved by serious and earnest discussion and not by importing controversial methods which we had hoped had been done away with.'

Dr. Headlam's attitude, which not only permits, but welcomes, thoughtful and reverent discussion of the difficulties of traditional theology, is an essential factor in any national religious revival: and those who are concerned for a return of material prosperity would do well to realize that as a national need it is secondary to religious revival, because it cannot be permanent unless based on it. For experience justifies the precept

> 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all things necessary for this life shall be added unto you.'

Dr. Temple's Modernist Kindergarten.

In the January *Pilgrim*, the Bishop of Manchester discusses the problem of the relation of Faith and Authority, with special reference to the practical difficulty of the Modernists. Some people profess to be confident that lay Modernists are a fictitious body, the invention of the imagination of Modernist clergy. But Dr. Temple is under no such delusion. He knows the Modernist laity exist, and that numerically they are not a negligible body:

> 'We find a very large number of people who are genuine disciples of Christ, saying their prayers and seeking to use their lives in whatever way may best prepare the way for the coming of that Kingdom of God which He proclaimed. But at one point or another they find themselves bound in conscience to dissent from the traditional belief. The dissent may concern fundamental principles or particular historic facts. A man who believes with all his soul that the only right way to live is the way that Jesus Christ taught and followed, sometimes finds himself unable to believe that Jesus Christ is God incarnate. He is a disciple and follower; but he cannot accept the fundamental article of the Christian Creed. Again, there are many who whole-heartedly accept that article, but are unable to assent to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth or to that of our Lord's physical

> Resurrection. What is the Church to do in relation to such classes of people? Two things would seem to me to be equally fatal: to modify the Creeds, and to ignore the people whom we are considering.'

We hardly know what Dr. Temple means by his phrase 'modify the Creeds.' Does he mean alter the text of the Creeds? No Modernist desires this. Does he mean alter the interpretation of the Creeds? Every educated English Traditionalist, including Dr. Temple, does this. Does he mean alter the use of the Creeds? We cannot tell. Does his opposition to the modification of the Creeds extend to opposition to the composition and authorization of some much more simple and practical credal statement, which might be used on certain occasions as an alternative to the Creeds? He has left us in the dark. Nevertheless there is something which is very prominent in his teaching, and which we are sure is a very prominent clause in the Creed by which he lives, which is absent from all the Creeds of the Church, *viz.* the Kingdom of God on earth.

But what is Dr. Temple's plan for helping the Modernists? It is to create a Church kindergarten for them, somewhat after the pattern of the primitive catechumenate; for Dr. Temple assumes that these Modernists, although 'mature in intelligence, may be very near the beginnings in their devotional life.' Of the Modernists he writes:

> 'They would, of course, be welcome—as all persons whatsoever are welcome—at the public services of the Church; but there would also be arranged services specially adapted to their needs, as to the manner of conducting which they should be fully consulted.'

This strikes us as *hardly* a practical proposal. Almost all the Modernist laity were once Traditionalist laity, and does Dr. Temple suppose that his catechumenate can enable them to retrace their steps, or that he can induce them to enter it for that purpose?

Moreover, Dr. Temple makes no provision for a Modernist clergy. Does he suppose that the people who have intellectual difficulties are going in any numbers to the Traditionalist clergy to resolve their doubts, and that those clergy (who under his scheme must regard them as imperfect Christians) will be able to effect this? The land is full of Traditionalist clergy to-day, easily accessible to all, and the bulk of the laity are falling away from the Church in spite of the fact. Who is more likely to be able to help the man who 'finds himself unable to believe that

Jesus Christ is God incarnate'; the clergyman whose teaching on the Incarnation has so far left the man cold and unconvinced, or the Modernist clergyman who can possibly present the doctrine of the Incarnation in the light of a new method? Our post-bag, during the past few months especially, bears eloquent testimony as to where such laity turn for help. Of this we are certain; it will prove impossible to retain the Modernist laity or regain the alienated laity unless the Church can train and utilise effectively a large body of Modernist clergy.

Dr. Temple's proposal also strikes the Modernist as wrong in principle. It is similar to that with which St. Paul was faced by the Judaizers. They were ready to admit Gentile Christians to the Catholic Church on conditions which seemed to the apostle to be hostile to the Christian spirit of freedom. Such a proposal was vigorously rejected by him, not because it was not well-meant, but because it was in opposition to the first principles of the religion of Christ, which is a religion of the spirit and not a religion of the letter.

Modern Churchmen do not wish to deprive their Traditionalist fellow-Churchmen of that which they value in creed and worship, but they do claim that the Church authorities ought to provide for the needs of her Modernist members; and that not as though they were erring children or semi-pagan Christians, but as brethren possessed of those full rights of membership that Traditionalists enjoy, with equal access to the sacraments and an equal right to exercise the functions of the Christian ministry.

We ought to add that Dr. Temple proposes to modify the baptismal vow when adult Modernists are baptized, but does not propose to modify it when the infants of Modernists are baptized. This is inconsistent. Why should a Modernist parent or Godparent be required to make an affirmation which he would not be required to make as principal? It is true that many nominal Churchpeople who act as Godparents, have not the remotest idea of what they are assenting to, and are quite as ready to say, 'I renounce them all,' at the end of the rehearsal of the articles of the Creed as to say, 'All this I steadfastly believe.' But the Modernist has neither the insensitiveness of the nominal Churchman nor the conservatism of the traditional Churchman in this matter.

The best solution for the present distress seems to us to be to provide alternative sets of services, with the understanding that the officiating minister, who is first and foremost *servus servorum Dei*, shall in the Occasional Services use that form which the parties concerned desire, and in the Public Offices those services which are duly authorized by the Bishop in accordance with the wish of the parochial representatives. To suppose that the authorization of one or two or three of these uses in a parish would lead to strife and division is to do a grave injustice to the increasing commonsense and good feeling of the laity. What does cause trouble in parishes and what has been responsible for emptying many churches is the forcing of services on the laity, without any alternative, with no regard to their consent, and often against their desires. There are very few of the younger men and women who would not feel that their neighbours of different religious views should be considered as well as themselves, and who would not welcome some working arrangement which would satisfy all parties. It is quite possible that many persons would welcome the variety of use.

In the same issue of the *Pilgrim*, Canon J. M. Wilson voices the Modernist demand in a valuable article expounding the principles of Modernism. He writes:

> 'No Modernist wishes to displace or discredit the traditional form of belief as held by anyone who is satisfied with it . . . But we ask for reciprocity: we also have a place in the Church of Christ; and we ask those who distrust and distress us to think yet again. Some of them we still regard with love as our 'lost leaders.'

What Dr. Temple proposes some may regard as jocosity, others as pomposity. What it is not, is reciprocity. It is the well-meant but impossible proposal of one of those 'who distrust and distress us.'

The Ninth Conference of Modern Churchmen.

The 1922 Conference of Modern Churchmen will be held at Somerville College, Oxford, from August 21st to 28th. The subject will be 'Christ and the World.'

A preparatory course of lectures and classes, introducing the subject and its literature, has been arranged for in April, at Tunbridge Wells.*

* Full particulars can be obtained from the Hon. Secretary, Miss Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley, Yorks.

THE ETHICS OF RELIGIOUS CONFORMITY

By the Rev. HAROLD ANSON, M.A.

IT has been well said that the Church of Christ has little cause for anxiety or self-accusation if it finds itself incurring the hatred or contempt of the worldly and careless folk of the day; but it has every reason for anxiety if it finds that earnest and truth-loving men and women are becoming indifferent or hostile to its claims. So to-day, we need not condemn ourselves because those whose minds are set upon this world have an undisguised contempt for the Church. It is all to the good that we do not now come across the case, quoted by Lord Morley as typical in 1874:

> 'We all of us know men who reject the entire Christian system, and still think it compatible with uprightness to summon their whole establishments round them at morning and evening, and on their knees to offer up elaborately formulated prayers, which have just as much meaning to them as the entrails of the sacrificial victims had to the infidel haruspex. We see the same men diligently attending religious services; uttering assents to confessions of which they really reject every syllable, kneeling, rising, bowing, with deceptive solemnity; even partaking of the sacrament with a consummate devoutness that is very edifying to all who are not in the secret, and who do not know that they are acting a part, and making a mock both of their own reason and their own probity, merely to please persons whose delusions they pity and despise from the bottom of their hearts.' (*On Compromise*, ch. iv.)

Such persons as these do not now conduct family prayers or go to Church: they spend their Sundays playing golf, and are surely nearer to religion than if they were compromising their sense of reality by going to Church. They do not form the most serious problem for the Church: though we cannot but wish that we could reach them. The serious problem is that those who do love truth and sincerity of speech and thought, those who have the love of clear thinking and clear utterance, are becoming, it is to be feared, increasingly doubtful about allying themselves closely with the Church. 'Most of the spiritually-minded people that I know,' recently said one who had good opportunities for judging the attitude of people to-day to religion, 'are indifferent to the Church, because they regard the Church as being not only indifferent to truth, but on the whole as rather hostile.' I believe that this is an opinion very

widely held among people sincerely anxious to be true to their highest visions of reality.

This view is not incompatible with a sincere admiration for the work done by the Church, or a willing recognition of the sympathy expressed by many of the leaders of the Church with great moral and political causes: but it is felt that men, if they are to keep honest, must not be too closely identified with the Church's attitude to truth. It is felt that bishops and clergy encourage people to dope their minds in order to be able to accept religious formulae: to engage in hard work in Boys' Clubs or Scouts' troops in order to solve, or avoid solving, intellectual difficulties; to consider the pain caused to their parents and elderly relations if they do not conform to the decent observances which no longer mean anything to them, to avoid the priggishness of refusing a grain of incense to the altar of a popular idol, especially when the refusal is likely to retard the sacred cause of 're-union.' 'I tell the young men who come to me for Ordination,' said a popular and eminent bishop the other day, 'not to bother about the Virgin Birth. I ordain them, and send them out into the slums, and I find they soon forget all about these worrying problems. I worried about them myself when I was a young man, but I tell them that hard parish work will solve their problems, as it did mine: and I never have any more trouble with them.'

No doubt many young men were cured of Christianity by well-meaning pagan priests by the same method, and if we believe that goodness and truth are separable, and that you can worship God with your heart, and neglect the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, then this method may answer very well; but if Christ is Truth, and Truth is Christ, the ministry of these doped men will not be in the long run to the glory of God, though it may bring an increase of Communicants at the moment.

Other bishops will say to ordinands (and this tends at the moment to be the official answer): 'So long as you don't deny, you are not asked to affirm.' This may be the only way out of a temporary difficulty, until formularies are altered, but it is not a dignified way, nor one which increases the respect of sincere men for the Church. It either places conscientious men in an intolerable difficulty, or it gradually accustoms them to

insincerity. Examples are not difficult to find. The first article of the Church of England defines the nature of God. It is, or ought to be, the most serious and solemn statement of belief, incomparably more important than articles about sacraments and ceremonies. This first article declares that God is *impassibilis*, *i.e.* incapable of suffering. This was always the traditional, orthodox view of God. It may be true, or untrue, but it is of much greater importance (if theology has any importance at all) that we should decide what we believe about this, than that we should make up our minds about this or that miracle of the Gospel. Yet Bishop Gore and many others find no difficulty at all in casting doubt upon this belief about God, and suggesting the opposite view. He writes:

> 'I feel sure that it was a false subservience to Greek philosophy which caused the Greek theologians to emphasize the impassibility of God in a sense which evacuates in great measure the meaning of the Bible.'

All English clergymen are required to assent to the statement that Christ, after His resurrection,

> 'Took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; wherewith he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all Men at the last day.'

Can it be truly said that this represents anything like the sense in which intelligent Christians envisage the present life and work of the Risen Christ?

Another article asserts that 'the Romish Doctrine concerning the Invocation of Saints is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God'; yet we read of a meeting of Church people at which a clergyman declares that the invocation of the mother of our Lord is one of the greatest needs of the Church of England. One would suppose that these people must feel uncomfortable when they know that their clergyman retains his position in the Church in virtue of having publicly declared that the Articles are agreeable to the Word of God. The Anglo-Catholic party are indeed faced with a constantly increasing moral problem, as they endeavour to reconcile a position constantly approximating more and more to that of the Roman Church with their profession of assent to a Liturgy and Articles carefully revised and altered to exclude that point

of view. Their problem in the ethics of conformity is perhaps more difficult than that of any other party in the Church, and many of their leaders are realizing that it cannot be conducive to the formation of the Christian character for ordinands to ridicule the formularies to which they are solemnly giving their assent, or, if not ridiculing them, to devote all their ingenuity to evading the force of their obvious meaning.

It used to be common to bring railing accusations against the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church, on the ground that they consciously misinterpreted the formularies, and even did so for the sake of the emoluments, which these ingenious 'restatements' of Anglican doctrine enabled them to retain. Thus the great Lord Falkland, speaking in 1640, says:

> 'Some have so industriously laboured to deduce themselves from Rome that they have given great suspicion that in gratitude they desire to return thither, or at least to meet it half way. Some have evidently laboured to bring in an English though not a Roman Popery; I mean not only the outside and dress of it, but equally absolute . . . Nay, common fame is more than ordinarily false, if none of them have found a way to reconcile the opinions of Rome to the preferments of England, and be so absolutely, directly, and cordially Papists that it is all that £1,500 a year can do to keep them from confessing it.'

Such unworthy charges are seldom made now, except, curiously enough, by this very section of the Church against their Liberal brethren. It is one of the mediaeval habits which we must all hope they will soon learn to discard.

But the most serious difficulty facing the Church is that of the able, scholarly, devout young man of to-day, who would like to be ordained, and ought to be ordained, but will not be ordained, because he has a deep distaste for the repression of doubts, or the evasion of the obvious meaning of theological formularies. He has a real devotion to Christ, he has a real desire to serve God in the ministry of the Church of England, but he cannot do it without so compromising his conscience that he cannot sincerely offer his life to God.

Those who know Oxford and Cambridge well, tell me that their experience is the same as my own: that these are the men we most want, and that (so far as we may know) God most wants, and that we are not getting to-day, and shall not get at all, so long as our conditions for entering into the ministry remain as they are. It is no doubt partly a problem of finance,

but those who are most ready to trust God for their living are the least ready to trust the Church with their conscience.

I know that some critics will say that this is a mistake, that the young are not attracted to 'Liberal Churchmanship' (or 'Modernism,' as its enemies prefer to call it). They say that only a few elderly Victorians cling to these ideals, and the young have long since outgrown the old-fashioned, nineteenth century views of the Churchmen's Union. 'The Churchmen's Union,' according to the witness of its enemies, denies the miraculous, because it still moves in the old forms of materialistic thought, and believes in the rigidity of material laws.

It seems a little odd that a society which includes among its members people like Mr. Raven, Mr. Emmet, Mr. Sheppard, Miss Dougall, Miss Royden, should be said to be failing to attract the young. My own experience is that the people who are attracting the abler men and women of the younger generation are almost all members of, or in close sympathy with, the 'Churchmen's Union.' Also, it seems incredible that anyone who knows anything about that body should say that its members find it impossible to accept the miraculous, owing to some preconceived theory that 'miracles don't happen.' I cannot remember having met one member of that body who is inclined to deny that matter is constantly yielding new and surprising evidence of its plasticity in the hands of men of imagination and faith, and that there is therefore every reason to suppose that similar events happened in the Gospel story. There is, I feel sure, no indisposition in the case of those who are nicknamed 'Modernists' to deny the possibility of such supranormal occurrences, or the fact that such occurrences do, as a matter of fact, take place from time to time.

The real difficulty, in so far as the question of religious conformity is concerned, is the question of evidence as to such and such a fact having actually occurred. It is remarkable how learned and judicious persons differ as to the amount of evidence which seems to them necessary for the establishment of a fact of an unusual kind having actually taken place. For instance, a scare headline in a picture paper announces that a clergyman has denied the Divinity of Christ. This seems quite sufficient and convincing evidence to some scholarly persons on which to form a serious charge that a group of clergy-

men have denied the Divinity of Christ, denied the Virgin Birth, denied the occurrence of miracles in the New Testament, and have become practical Unitarians—all of which charges turn out to be untrue. It is, however, interesting and significant, as showing the kind of evidence which would appear to such minds as sufficient for establishing the truth of any occurrence in history. Or again, a theologian says that we can be sure of St. Mark's accuracy because St. Mark got his facts from St. Peter, and St. Peter was relating facts which occurred only thirty years previously. Now to most people it would seem that in order to come to such a conclusion, we must first know not only that St. Mark was a good man, but that he was an accurate recorder; and secondly, that St. Peter was also not only a good man, which we have no reason to doubt, but had also the faculty, which is very rare, of being able to repeat facts tinged with a very strong emotional significance, for thirty years, without unconsciously altering them. We know very well that a tradition may take not thirty years, but thirty seconds, to become established, and having once become established, it becomes impious to doubt it. How difficult it would be if we had no written records, and trusted only to the records of living eye-witnesses, to know what kind of person Queen Victoria was, and what she actually said and did. How much more difficult to come to any really satisfactory conclusions as to the alleged supranormal events connected with Professor W. Crookes, Professor Wallace, Mr. Stainton Moses, Mr. F. W. Myers, all of whom died, if I am not mistaken, within thirty years.

What then ought men to do, who have a deep and sincere conviction that Jesus incarnated in his life and teaching the very truth and character of God, so that those who saw Him could in a very real sense say that they had seen the Father? They believe also that there is no reason to doubt all the main facts of His life, including many 'miraculous' events, and including the real, objective, manifestations of His personality after death. They have no difficulty in believing in the probability of such events, because they have been interested in psychical research, and they know that there is some considerable evidence for communication from persons already passed out of the body, especially during the days or weeks

immediately following death. But they do not see that it is possible that we can ever get sufficient evidence to establish the accuracy of the exact details of these Gospel stories. No evidence that is ever likely to be available can be expected to establish the accuracy of the details, especially the supranormal details, of the Gospel history. If it is a matter of extreme difficulty to establish the real facts, and the real significance of the facts, of the healing of a lame man at Lourdes, or at a 'Christian Science' practitioner's consulting room in London in 1921, how can we ever hope to have evidence which will enable us to know exactly what happened on the first Easter Day? But we have no difficulty in believing that some event happened which those who saw it recorded as truthfully as they could, and that the main facts were such as are actually narrated. Let us suppose that such a man also thinks that, in any case, his faith does not rest upon the accuracy of these supranormal occurrences. He believes, with Matthew Arnold, that because a man turns a pen into a penwiper, it is no proof that his teaching is true. He believes in Jesus as the Son of God not because of the miracles (though he believes that miracles did happen), but because of His teaching, His life, and the subsequent effect of His life upon the world. If all the miracles were doubtful, that would not alter his faith. In his attitude towards miracles he is surely right. It happened to a very intimate friend of my own that he was instrumental in curing completely a poor woman whose life was despaired of by her doctor. This he did by spiritual means alone. Shortly afterwards he went to see her, and she told him that she had heard all about his having cured a boy who was born blind in the immediate neighbourhood. He denied it, for indeed there was not even any possible basis for such a story. The woman, however, steadfastly asserted her belief, for, as she said, 'all the street knows about it.' The rumour had become to be definite assertion, and a firm belief among a considerable group of good, earnest people, within a few days. It was, as a fact, completely false, but the cure of the woman herself was completely true, and the fact of her being a most unreliable witness to the second case did not affect the truth of her account of her own case.

What ought a bishop to say to this man when he asks for

ordination, if he ever surmounts his scruples sufficiently to get so far?

He can joyfully accept the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith, as he understands them, he believes that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, he believes in the Holy Spirit, in the Holy Catholic Church, the Forgiveness of Sins, the resurrection of the personality after death, in the life everlasting; he would not wish to *deny* the Virgin Birth or 'The Empty Tomb,' but he does not feel that they matter very much, and he does not see that they can ever be proved or disproved as material facts, and therefore cannot honestly affirm them as historical occurrences.

I am quite sure that this type of man is the type from which our best ordinands can be drawn to-day, and the authorities of the Church must decide at once what they propose to do with them. At present these men are, as I know from my own experience, very reluctantly taking up other lines of work. They feel they are not wanted, unless they will be untrue to their own conscience.

The very ingenious methods of explaining away the force of the Thirty-Nine Articles which enables the Anglo-Catholic to be ordained, do not appeal to the kind of man I am thinking of. (I think there are signs that the Anglo-Catholic is not quite happy about them.) The man of whom I am thinking is inclined to agree with Bishop Gore that it is not a very sincere attitude of mind to assert a doctrine which implies belief in a definite fact having occurred, when what he means is that, though he is not in the least prepared to say that the fact occurred, he believes in the spiritual truth to which the alleged fact bears witness. We may quite grant that many people could not believe in the Incarnation unless they believe in the Holy Babe of Prague in cope and sceptre and crown, but that is no reason why I should express my belief in the Holy Infant of Prague as a real and historical picture of the historical Jesus when I really mean to express the fact that I believe in Jesus as King of men. I really mean that it may conceivably be a fact of history and certainly is a valued symbol to many of eternal truth. These, and the similar evasions resorted to by Anglo-Catholics, to enable them to interpret Protestant formularies in a Catholic sense, may be justified as an *interim*

measure while the Church is in process of re-stating its belief, provided that the understanding is public and open, but I feel quite sure that the best men in the new generation will not be able to accept this compromise, except on these terms, without a sense of moral and intellectual uncleanness. 'Blessed are the pure in heart' means something much more than an assertion of the moral value of sexual cleanness; it means 'Blessed are those who are true and sincere in heart, undefiled by the evasions and subterfuges of the worldly mind.'

It is true that the bishops, by saying 'we will allow you to state your belief in a fact, when in reality you mean your belief in the moral value of the idea which underlies the fact,' do in some degree absolve the person from insincerity who makes the declaration with that clearly-understood promise. The man who says that the invocation of saints is a vain and foolish doctrine knows that, as a matter of fact, the bishop who ordains him knows that he holds, and proposes to commend, that doctrine, and so understands his declaration; but I don't think that the best type of man will, in the future, acquiesce in this evasion, and I, for one, hope he will not, for I am persuaded that by doing so he accustoms his mind, and the minds of those whom he teaches, to insincerity, and to insincerity in those matters which most deeply concern the soul of man; and thus men who love truth come 'to abhor the offering of God.'

I know that many people will say to me, 'You are overscrupulous; why bother over little matters? A little evasion here and there does no great harm.' But it *does* do harm when a preparation for ordination is felt to be a course of instruction in the methods of evading the plain meaning of statements.

A friend of mine asked an Italian Roman Catholic many years ago which Cardinal was likely to be the next Pope. The Italian mentioned a certain Cardinal, who was commonly believed to keep a mistress. My friend recalled this fact, and said, 'Surely such an election is incredible.' 'Ah!' said the Italian, 'you English think there is no virtue but chastity.' It did not seem to the Italian impossible to condone inchastity in high office, when the interests of the Church made such condonation desirable. And is not truth-speaking as great a virtue as chastity? Is it a small thing for a clergyman at the most solemn moment of his life to feel that he is making all sorts of

small dissimulations, which he would not make, for a moment, in any other walk of life? Is that a less sin than inchastity? Is it not indeed a very real sin against purity?

I know very well that it is argued that all our religious language is symbolical, including the assertion of the Fatherhood of God, but I cannot see how that is an excuse for our not making every effort to make our symbols as near to the truth as human language can come. It is no excuse for our saying that God is impassible when in fact we believe that He is continually suffering, or to thank God, as we often do in the Burial Service, for removing a person from this world when in fact we believe by his own misconduct he has removed himself.

The crisis is very serious, and the need for action very pressing if the Church of England is to retain the loyalty of the ablest and most honest of the younger men and women. What can we do to meet it?

I would suggest that all who feel that the problem is indeed a serious problem should meet and lay their difficulties seriously before those who have the duty and responsibility of admitting or repelling men from the ministry of the Church. They should get in touch also with those younger people who are now, sadly and reluctantly, turning away from the ministry and the active membership of the Church. They should make them realise that their view is shared by a considerable and warmly sympathetic group already in the ministry of the Church.

As an *interim* measure, such men should be encouraged to be ordained only with the distinct and clear understanding, not made in confidence, but openly and explicitly, that they accept the formularies in the only sense in which most educated men and women do accept them, as the nearest approximation which the Church of the sixteenth century was able to make towards truth, and an approximate formulation acceptable pending the very urgently expected time when they shall be formulated, if it is necessary to formulate them, anew. No one can reasonably expect that a great historical society can be for ever revising its formularies, or that, at any given time, the formulation of the beliefs of the society shall in all points conform to those of the dominant opinions of the good people

of the day; but we have a right to ask that the Church shall not go on acquiescing voluntarily in evasions and equivocations. If such a demand were made, it may well be that those who are in authority would definitely decide that no alteration can be made in the formularies, and that no public and explicit approval can be given to those who are willing, pending a change in the formularies, to make the declarations in the sense in which they publicly and freely state them. The situation would then be clear. The Church would go its way: those whose case I have tried to define would go theirs. That is happening now: the drift would merely become emphasised. But all who love the Church of England must hope that this may not happen.

The point at issue which is becoming acute to-day is clearly expressed in a letter of George Tyrrell to Baron F. von Hügel, in 1907.[1]

> 'The Holy Child of Prague stands before me in crown and sceptre and royal cope. Is this, as a child would suppose, a literal portrait of the boy of Nazareth? or is it mere symbolism? Neither wholly. There is a core of fact idealized, or artistically completed, to bring out the true inward significance of Christ's Kingship, concealed by the mere historic aspect of the boy of Nazareth. I say the same of all the legendary idealization of the historical Jesus. It is born of the same impulse which makes His love *visible* by putting His heart outside His body and setting fire to it. It is the inward truth of history, but it is not historic truth. That He was born of a Virgin and ascended into heaven may be but a "visibilising" of the truth of His transcendence as divine: "No man hath ascended but Him who hath descended and Who is in heaven." The Virgin Birth may but teach the same truth as "He who does the will of my Father is my Mother," *i.e.* the soul which is impregnated by the Holy Spirit reproduces Christ in its own bosom. But I do not feel bound to find *how* each bit of the creed helps to the one truth symbolized by the whole. I will not tinker or tamper with that work of primitive inspiration, with the image which truth made of itself in the mind of a prophetic era. I would as soon think of touching up the *Cenacle* of da Vinci, or correcting the *Divina Commedia* in the light of critical knowledge of history and science.'

This almost exactly represents the view of the Christian faith held by many earnest men and women to-day, who feel anxious as to their position in the Church.

Can the Church of England assimilate this belief? Does it want the ministry of these people? An eminent theologian of the Roman Catholic Church expressed the opinion that George Tyrrell need never have left the Roman Catholic

[1] George Tyrrell, *Letters*, p. 58.

Church if he had been less anxious to force an issue with the authorities.

But in the Church of England we can only grow by making our positions clear, and by a voluntary, candid toleration of clearly-expressed differences of belief. And few will hesitate to affirm that the loss of these people will be an immense impoverishment of the Church of England.

> 'The possibility,' says Lecky, 'of the National Church remaining in touch with the more instructed and intellectual portions of the community depends mainly on the latitude of opinion that is accorded to its clergy, and on their power of welcoming and adopting new knowledge, and it may reasonably be maintained that few greater calamities can befall a nation than the severance of its higher intelligence from religious influences.'

That this, which Lecky feared, is happening to-day, no reasonable person can doubt, and that the deepest cause of it is that the Church is gravely under suspicion of not only condoning, but encouraging, intellectual insincerity, few will doubt either, I believe.

The policy of throwing four anchors out of the stern, and wishing for the day, is a very favourite policy with all societies, but one which may lead ultimately to shipwreck. And it is poor comfort that even then the passengers, 'some on boards and some on broken pieces of the ship,' may still arrive at the haven of truth, and save their own souls, when the ship has been broken upon the rocks.

The Church moves, no doubt. A Prayer Book, revised to meet the difficulties of the last generation, may soon be presented to the generation which is growing up. There is no sign that it is going to meet the difficulties of those who have life in this world before them. Those who still attend the services regularly need no reforms, and, for the most part, have no doubts. Those who are most deeply interested in religion have in large part been already driven away.

They *can* be recalled. But does the Church *want* to recall them? or does it prefer the ministry of those who never doubt?

It is possible to have a Church, as anyone who knows the colonies can affirm, with a perfect constitution and no life.

It is all to the good that the Church should reform its constitution, but what good will that be, if it has already alienated its most devoted children?

SOME MODERN PROBLEMS OF THE MISSION FIELD*

I. The Relation of Christianity to other Religions.

By the Rev. E. C. Dewick, M.A., Acting-Principal of St. Paul's College, Calcutta: formerly Principal of St. Aidan's, Birkenhead.
Author of *Primitive Christian Eschatology*.

THE problem of Comparative Religion is not one which appears specially urgent to the average Christian in England, or indeed anywhere in Europe. He may, or may not, be satisfied with current orthodoxy; he may, or may not, desire a new theology; but the possibility that there may be already in existence religious systems which can be regarded as (actually or potentially) serious rivals to Christianity is an idea which rarely, if ever, enters his mind. It often seems to me that this is particularly true of the 'Liberal' theologian in England. However much he may pride himself on his absence from prejudice, and his fearlessness in the search for truth, there remains in his mind a vast 'background of ideas' of which he is barely conscious, which he inherits from long centuries of Western Christianity, and which appear to him to be axioms so obvious that no sane person can question their validity. Yet these axioms are, to the minds of millions of educated human beings in other parts of the world, highly debateable problems; while they, for their part, accept as axioms ideas which to the Westerner seem to be scarcely worthy of serious consideration. A couple of examples will illustrate my meaning. The Liberal Western thinker *may* have his doubts as to the *certainty* of human immortality; but he rarely has any doubts as to its *desirability*, and he is inclined to dismiss with scant consideration the widespread Oriental view that immortality is a burden from which mankind must ever seek salvation. Or again, the European thinker has inherited (often

* The writers of the series of articles, of which this is the first, are working in India, and while the problems discussed are not limited to any one country, the treatment is of necessity coloured by a close contact with the present Indian situation.

unconsciously) the Judaeo-Christian emphasis on the Transcendence of God; and even if he admits in theory the Divine Immanence, he rarely seems to have made this a real part of his own religious thought and outlook. Consequently, if he ever has occasion to refer to non-Christian religious ideas, his remarks are often characterized by a note of contemptuousness which thinly veils a complete absence of intelligent knowledge of the subject.

Now if this be true with regard to the past, it is of urgent importance that it shall not be true of the future. The ever-increasing facilities for the interchange of ideas between all parts of the world, and the consequent unifying of human thought, make it impossible for any intelligent man to continue to ignore the religious ideals of other peoples. And, further, there is a growing conviction among the younger generation of Christians, especially in the mission-field, that there is a deep unity underlying all human experience, and that a true understanding of the One Spirit of God can only be based upon a study of His working among all His children.

For the Christian missionary, indeed, this problem of comparative religion is the most urgent of all problems. In his case, it is never in the background, but in the very forefront of his daily work. He may, it is true, have trained himself deliberately to close his eyes and ears to its call, and to rivet his mind and teaching upon the formulas learnt in the lecture-halls of English Theological Colleges long years ago; but if he is a 'live' man, such a course is impossible for him. I know that there are many young missionaries to-day who are carrying on their work, feeling all the time that the Christian message, as they have come to understand it in the light of the new knowledge, though it has been to *them* 'the power of God unto salvation,' has not been satisfactorily related to the environment in which they live; and that 'the relation of Christianity to other religions' is the great Unsolved Problem, which is continually pressing upon them for a solution which shall be true to all the experiences of human life.

To such missionaries, it is good news to hear that the Churchmen's Union is proposing to give its attention at its 1922 Conference to some of the problems of Comparative

Religion; and it is in the hope of stimulating interest in the subject by approaching these from the point of view of the Mission Field that this series of articles are being written.

There are, I think, four broad divisions of thought on this subject of the relation of Christianity to other religions.

1. There is the view that Christianity contains the whole of truth, while all varieties of 'heathenism' are wholly of the devil, and their adherents debarred from salvation. Such was the conviction of almost all missionaries a hundred years ago; and undoubtedly it affords a mighty impetus to missionary zeal. Few thoughts can be more heart-rending than the contemplation of the endless procession of human souls descending into eternal torment at the rate of many hundreds per minute; and the work of 'salvation' based upon this conception could be easily grasped and vividly realized. Even to this day, I doubt if any type of preaching is more *immediately* effective with simple village audiences than this, if delivered by a man whose heart is in his message. Nevertheless, this type of missionary is becoming steadily rarer, though it is by no means as extinct as many people suppose. The majority of missionaries, however, have felt that the facts of life are conclusively against such an interpretation. The *good* that is visible in non-Christian religions is too unmistakeable; and any attempt to affirm that it is in reality only evil in disguise leads to an atmosphere of unreality, or to an utter perversion of the moral sense. If the general trend of the last ten years is any sure guide as to the future, we may say that this view of the relation of Christianity to other religions is not likely to be a serious factor in solving the problem.

2. A much commoner view is that which is indicated in the title of Dr. J. N. Farquhar's book, *The Crown of Hinduism*. According to this view, Christianity contains the *sum* of all truth, which is seen in a partial and fragmentary manner in other religions. They are the 'broken lights'; it is the 'perfect ray.' The Christian missionary of this type comes to the non-Christian with a message that is intended 'not to destroy, but to fulfil'; he will welcome frankly the good elements that are found in other religions, while maintaining that they are all

to be found in full measure in Christ. The convert who embraces the Gospel is taught to regard it not so much as the denial of his old belief, but as its Crown; he may even say (as a recent convert said to the writer a few weeks ago): 'I feel I never was a *true* Hindu until I became a Christian.'

According to this view, there is clearly full scope for the Christian missionary in non-Christian lands. His attitude towards other religions will be sympathetic—sometimes I think it is so sympathetic that he almost ignores the darker side of heathenism, or attempts to explain it away—but at least he may be sure that he is *needed*, and that without his message—Christ's message—the religious development of the world will not make progress, and the Crown thereof will not be reached. Non-Christian religions need not be regarded as the enemies of the Gospel, nor as rivals to be mercilessly crushed; but neither can they be regarded as allies who have any independent contribution to make towards the campaign for the truth, and their ultimate fate must be to become absorbed into the Kingdom of Christ.

Those who hold this view generally lay great stress upon the necessity for the rite of baptism in the case of all converts. Sometimes this is due to a theory of the Church and of the Sacraments which logically tends to the doctrine that baptism is the only gateway to salvation, and which might seem to approximate in this respect towards the views of the older Evangelical missionaries regarding the final destinies of the heathen. But in practice, the modern Anglo-Catholic missionary seems unwilling to lay much stress on this negative aspect of his ecclesiastical theory, and prefers to expatiate upon the amenities of life within the ark of salvation, rather than upon the fate of unbaptized Quakers and heathen who remain outside.

The necessity of baptism is, however, insisted upon with almost equal urgency by many whose sacramental doctrines are by no means clearly defined; partly because of the moral value of an act of public profession of Christianity, and partly because they hold that, even if none of the existing branches of the Church are entirely flawless, they are at least far more true to Christ's ideal than the non-Christian religious communities.

Therefore, although the non-Christian *religions* may be regarded in some sense as stepping-stones towards the religion which is their Crown, the convert must definitely resign his membership of his old religious *community*, before he can be publicly recognized as a Christian.

3. There is a third view, which is very closely related to the last-named in theory and theology, but which differs from it sufficiently to lead towards a considerable divergence in practice. It accepts the contention that Christ is the Crown of all human thought and religious aspiration; but it insists that Christ is not adequately expressed by any one of the existing Christian organizations. Those who hold this view maintain that none of our existing formularies or Church-systems give a complete picture of the truth as it is in Jesus; that all our present theology and ecclesiastical organizations are derived from Europe or the 'Near East,' and that India and the Far East must be free to develop their interpretation of Christ without being confined to the bounds of any creeds or systems hitherto devised in the history of Christendom.

The practical result of this view is that its adherents find it very difficult to co-operate with existing Missionary Societies or Churches, which generally require from their agents some conformity to existing systems and formularies. They tend therefore to work in isolation from other Christians, or not to do Evangelistic work at all. They lay little or no stress upon baptism, on the ground that baptism *in practice* (though not in theory) implies adherence to one of the existing 'traditional' Churches; and in many cases they definitely advise those who come under their influence to remain unbaptized 'until there are true and free Churches of the East, untrammelled by Western theology.'

In India, this view finds a good deal of favour among the younger generation of Christians; its adherents form the nucleus of the 'Christo Samaj,' and have considerable influence in the Student Christian Movement. At the present time, its strength lies more in political than in theological considerations. It is highly flattering to the young Nationalist to be told that the East can develop an entirely new type of Christian

theology; and it gives him a welcome excuse for adopting a policy of non-cooperation with the Western missionary, which fits in admirably with the spirit of the times. This does not, of course, prove that his contentions are untrue; but it does serve as a warning that in order to arrive at a fair conclusion, the political bias needs to be disentangled from other considerations; just as the Western missionary needs to be on his guard against a contrary political bias in discussing this question. At present, this idea that the East can supplement or correct the traditional theology of historic Christianity has been taken up mainly by Indian Christians; a few European missionaries have 'dabbled' with it in theory, but only one or two, whose sympathy with Indian Nationalism is very pronounced, have cared to work out its implications and see whither they tend. Indeed, as long as a missionary remains attached to one of the European Missions, his adventures in this direction are of necessity somewhat limited.

The important practical difference between this view and the one previously mentioned is, that it allows its adherents to remain unbaptized, and to continue their membership of their old religious community, though in most cases there will be certain practices (*e.g.* idol-worship, the observance of caste, &c.) which will be discontinued. But in the case of Hinduism, at least, this can be comparatively easily arranged, provided that the community-traditions are not outraged by the public act of baptism. Such a course obviously offers a dangerous loophole for those whose consciences have been touched by the Christian message, but whose wills lack the moral courage needed for a public profession, and in whose case the demand for baptism provides, for this very reason, a necessary moral stimulus. On the other hand, it does in certain cases give an opportunity for Christian witness in the old home, which would otherwise be impossible because the home-ties and home-love have been shattered; and such an opportunity, if faithfully used, may result in a wonderful spread of Christian ideals and the Christian spirit through a whole community.

Between this view and the one previously mentioned there is no difference as to ultimate aim or ideals, but only as to methods. Both are agreed that Jesus Christ is the Crown of

human life, and the supreme Revelation of God; both look forward to a day when the religion of the world shall be Christo-centric, and not an eclectic religion borrowing its elements in more or less equal degree from all the great religious systems of the past. The function of the East, according to the view which we have last been considering, is to re-interpret Jesus Christ, not to supplement the teaching and revelation of Christ by means of elements derived from quite independent sources. Its adherents may not be able now, for temporary reasons, to co-operate with Western missionaries; but on the basis of their theory, they are entitled, and even required, to be missionaries; for they, as Christians, have something unique to give to the non-Christian world in the name of Christ, and they can call upon all men to make Him the centre and goal of all life.

4. There remains yet another line of approach to the problem of the relation of Christianity to other religions. It is not, at the present time, widely held in Christian circles, and it is still less frequently expressed in public. But it is 'at the back of the minds' of a good many young Christians; and so far as it is erroneous, it can be met only by frank and fair argument, and not by a policy of silence or of denunciation. Those who hold this view are in agreement with other Christians that Jesus Christ is the supreme revelation of God in all human history, and His teaching represents the highest level of human thought and aspiration. But they hold that His teaching does not cover the whole range of God's truth, and that there are aspects of truth which the Divine Spirit has revealed to men by channels independent of the Christian tradition and the recorded teaching of Jesus Christ. In other words, they accept Jesus Christ and His teaching as *supreme* over all others, but not as *all-inclusive*. For them, the full content of the 'Logos' —God's Word to man—is larger than the content of 'Jesus Christ.'

Consequently, they are prepared, not only to re-interpret Jesus Christ by means of the Wisdom of the East, but to supplement His teaching with truths which are not found expressed or implied within the pages of the New Testament.

They regard non-Christian religions as fellow-learners together with Christianity in the great school of God's knowledge; and they are prepared to learn from them, as well as to receive. They look forward to a world-religion of an eclectic type, in which the Christian element will be indeed predominant, but in which other elements will have a real, if subordinate, place.

Can those who hold such a view be Christian missionaries? To the present writer, it does not seem possible to reconcile this view, by any amount of intellectual juggling, with the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, as expressed in the Catholic Creeds; and it is difficult to see how any missionary who definitely accepts this position could continue to hold office in a mission authorized by any of the 'Confessional' Churches, which base their theology on Nicaea or Chalcedon. In the case of Churches (such as the Congregational) in which no credal test is required of its ministers, the position is less clear. Even then, there would seem to be little place for 'missionary work' in the old sense of the attempt to make *converts* to Christianity; for if the various religious systems are all the fruits of the Divine Spirit working 'at sundry times and in divers manners,' then a transference of allegiance from one system to another is a policy of doubtful value, and indeed rather conducive to sow discord among allies.

There might still, however, be room for a missionary holding these views to work simply as a 'friend and helper' among non-Christians, teaching them those aspects of truth which have come to him through the Christian tradition, and yet ready to learn from them in his turn.

Very few of those who are now working in the mission-field in connection with any Church, would explicitly hold the view which I have outlined above; but it certainly is 'in the air'; and it is much wiser to face it frankly than to try and ignore it or suppress it without discussion. The theosophical movement has done much to spread the idea of an eclectic religion, while at the same time it has seriously discredited it by associating it with wild and dogmatic speculations regarding the unknown and unknowable. But the idea of a 'League of Religions' is attractive to many minds at this time, and it seems to fit in with a widespread revolt against the methods of 'Im-

perialism,' whether in State or Church. It demands careful consideration and reasoned criticism.

It has been the purpose of this paper simply to set forth some of the aspects of this subject, 'Christianity in relation to other religions,' as they present themselves to one who is working in the mission-field, and not to offer a ready-made solution. I would conclude by gathering together a few of the questions which seem to me to call most urgently for careful thought on the part of the whole Church in this connection.

1. For those who hold the first-mentioned view—that Christianity alone contains the *whole* of that which is true and good—the whole matter will probably seem to be outside the range of legitimate discussion. If a missionary seriously believes that there is no real good to be found in non-Christian religions, then it is unlikely that he will be willing to approach the subject in a spirit of impartial inquiry.

2. Those who hold the second view—that Christianity is the Crown of all that is good in the other religions—have, to my mind, a strong case on their side, and at the present time they comprise, I believe, the bulk of thoughtful missionaries, at any rate in India. But there are certain questions which must be faced by them, if they are to make good their claims:

(*a*) Can it be shown that organized Christianity really contains or implies all that is good and true in other systems? Is the teaching of Christ in the New Testament free from all limitations due to the Jewish tradition which lay behind it and around it? Or does that tradition itself contain the elements of an universal religion?

(*b*) Is organized Christianity, in its present form, sufficiently true to the Mind of Christ to justify us in demanding from all who seek to follow Him that they shall publicly transfer their allegiance from their old religious community to one of the existing Churches in the mission field? Is the insistence upon external baptism in all cases in accordance with the teaching and Spirit of Jesus Christ?

3. For those who hold the third view—that Christ is supreme, but the existing Churches are not fit to represent Him, and that His followers need not associate themselves with

organized Christianity—the same questions are again relevant. They will also do well to consider these points:

(*a*) Can they safeguard their policy against the danger that it will pander to the weak-willed convert who shrinks from the moral demands of a public profession?

(*b*) Can a religious movement without any organization retain its virility? Will it not in practice be forced to organize itself, and so become simply another Christian sect?

(*c*) Is a policy of non-cooperation with the existing Churches, because they are not in all respects ideal, in accordance with the example of God in Christ? Does He not co-operate with us men, in spite of our imperfections?

4. From those who hold the fourth view, and who look forward to an eclectic world-religion in the future, we may rightly ask for a clear statement of those truths which they believe to be inherent in other religions, and not in Jesus Christ. Often it seems to me that this point of view rests more upon *feeling* than upon solid facts. Many folk feel that the idea of the One Spirit working through all life gives them a satisfactory 'Weltanschauung,' the harmony of which is rather broken by the idea of a single, final and complete revelation at a particular historical moment. Such a feeling *may* be sound; but if so, it needs to be supported by solid evidence; and hitherto the supporters of the 'Eclectic Religion of the Future' seem to have been more ready to deal in generalities than to relate their theory to the facts of life, and the actual teachings of the various religions in existence. Unless they can show that Jesus Christ and His teaching are in some respects *defective*, they cannot fairly ask His followers to go outside His religion in order to attain to a fuller truth.

Such are some of the problems which press for solution in the mission field to-day. They are large enough, and complex enough, to cause the most adventurous to pause before pronouncing judgment. But 'the Spirit of Truth shall guide us into all Truth.'

THE MESSIANIC HOPE*

By the Rev. B. H. Streeter, D.D., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and Canon Residentiary of Hereford.

'And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.' (Isaiah xi. 6 and 9.)

THE Cross of Christ, which to us both sums up the moral grandeur of an heroic career, and is also the symbol of the creative love of God, was an all but insuperable difficulty to the Christian apologist in the early Church. Christ crucified was to the Jew 'a stumbling block'; for it was incredible that the fate of an ordinary bandit should have been the lot of that Messiah whose coming was to be the consummation of history, the realization of the national destiny of God's chosen people, and the final and triumphant justification of the ways of God to man; while to the Greek, as to the disciple of Nietzsche to-day, the Cross suggested an ethical ideal which could only be stigmatized as 'foolishness.'

Against the criticism of Jew and Greek alike, the most effective and formidable reply of the Christian apologist was the argument from Messianic prophecy, which a pious founder has prescribed as the subject of to-day's sermon. The Old Testament, or at least the greater part of it, had been translated into Greek for the use of the Jewish communities settled in every important town of the Roman Empire, probably as much as three centuries before the preaching journeys of St. Paul; and the missionary propaganda of the synagogue had made the existence of it known to large circles outside the Jewish community. To the Jew the Old Testament was an inspired work. To the Greek, who belonged to that comparatively small and highly-educated class which strove to keep alive the purity of the Attic tradition and was infected by that aristocratic exclusiveness which belongs to a culture which always looks back to a golden age, it would have been as un-

* A sermon preached before the University of Oxford, Jan. 29, 1922.

congenial as it was unknown. But to the Hellenised Gentile of the middle classes it came with the prestige attaching to a document of admitted antiquity, enhanced by the curious glamour which the reputed wisdom of the mysterious East has always had, and still has, for the half-educated Western mind. If, then, it could be shown that the prophets of the Old Testament had not only foretold the coming of the Messiah, but had foreseen His death and resurrection; and if besides this it could be made evident that a long series of relatively unimportant details in His earthly career had been accurately predicted, the presumption that the Person whose coming had been prepared for in this impressive way was no other than the Son of God whom Christianity preached, was one difficult to refute.

But to-day this, the most ancient, the most trusted weapon in the armoury of the apologist, has been seriously discredited by the critical study of the Old Testament. As traditionally employed, the argument from prophecy is in frequent conflict with the application of the principle that the true interpretation of any passage is to be found, by a study of its context, in the meaning which it would have had to the contemporaries of the actual writer, and must not be treated as an isolated oracle which could have no interest or significance to those to whom it was originally addressed. In St. Matthew's Gospel we are constantly told that a certain incident in the life of Christ occurred in order 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet.' But turn to the original context and you find, for instance, that the words, 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son,' are in Hosea an allusion to the Exodus, and were never intended as a prophecy of the infancy of Christ. Again, when Jeremiah speaks of 'Rachael weeping for her children and would not be comforted,' it is of the desolation left behind by the invading armies of his own time that he is thinking, not of a massacre of Holy Innocents some seven centuries later.

Although, however, the diligence and ingenuity of the Christian apologist led to a quite illegitimate multiplication of the number of passages in the Old Testament supposed to be of a Messianic character, the residuum of passages which are undoubtedly Messianic is still large, and, taken all together, they constitute one of the most remarkable features of the Old

Testament—I would say rather, one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of human thought.

We shall, however, totally misconceive the real meaning of this phenomenon unless we completely disabuse our minds of the search for apologetic proof texts. We shall see its significance only if we regard the Messianic Hope as the most impassioned expression in history of faith in the moral government of the Universe, and as the most sublime expression in literature of the unconquerable optimism of man. If Faith, Hope and Charity fitly summarize the characteristically Christian attitude of man to life and to the Power which controls the Universe, we must attribute both the fact that Hope is included in the list at all, and the precise quality of what is meant by Hope, to the spirit of the Messianic expectation.

In recent European literature the note of pessimism has rung out loud; it has been re-echoed too in the utterances of the Christian pulpit. And that the economic, and still more the moral, situation of Europe to-day provides a soil upon which optimism can flourish easily, few would have the hardihood to assert. So far as the actual situation of the world to-day goes, those who base their optimism upon purely empirical observation do not find it easy to produce conclusive arguments. It was said of a certain pessimist of an earlier time that he always foresaw, and foresaw quite correctly, the inevitable consequences of certain tendencies and certain happenings; what, however, he did not foresee was certain other happenings and tendencies which the future had in store and which, in the result, did much to counteract the disasters he predicted. Let us hope that the future has some such salvation waiting for us now. But whether or not pessimism is justified by a reasonable survey of the present situation, it is certainly opposed to the fundamental genius of Christianity, central to which is the conviction, inherited from Jewish Messianism and re-affirmed by Christ Himself, that the Kingdom of God, however long may be the interval, however great the intervening disasters, will assuredly in the long run come.

The Messianic hope is not primarily concerned, as the old apologetic supposed, with the Person of the Messiah. It is always and consistently of a social character. The Messianic

kingdom is Utopia, as it was envisaged by the religious passion and the ethical insight of the Hebrew. But naturally at different dates and under different external circumstances, Utopia is visualized under different forms. In the earlier period it is thought of as a highly-idealized variety of the patriarchal and mainly agricultural state, and, at this stage, the Messianic King is not yet conceived of as one unique individual who shall usher in a new era. The promise, as it is given to David by the prophet Nathan, is not that an individual, but that a succession of kings, shall spring from his loins, to each of whom, so long as he is obedient to the Divine Will, is given the assurance, 'I will be his Father and he shall be my son.' The title Son of God at this early period did not mean one single individual, but the patriarchal King for the time being, conceived of as the Vicegerent of Jehovah and invested with a sacro-sanctity which may perhaps be paralleled in modern times by that ascribed by his simpler subjects to the Mikado of Japan, or by devout Catholics to the Pope of Rome. Even in Isaiah this conception is not fundamentally changed, only it is hoped that to the house of David there will be born a son of gifts sufficiently remarkable to re-establish the national prosperity and the national morale, and start again the good tradition.

Yet with Isaiah we enter upon a new and far more significant phase of the Messianic Hope. The optimism expressed in the Messianic promise of Nathan to David was, like the optimism of the Victorian age in this country, born of a period of material prosperity exceeding anything previously attained by the nation, accompanied by an outburst of literary activity and of moral idealism. The optimism expressed in the prophecies of Isaiah is an optimism of a different and of a more heroic quality. It is the optimism born in dark days, which looks beyond the immediate present, and which, at a time of disaster and disillusionment, is bold to affirm with more persistent emphasis its faith in ultimate goodness. It is an optimism which looks back on a great and worthy past and asseverates its conviction that the great 'not-ourselves,' which made this achievement possible, has not lost its potency, but on the contrary has greater things in store. It is an optimism which has read the progress

achieved in earlier times as the expression of a Divine Purpose, and therefore declines to believe that the desolation of the present is more than a temporary setback to the fulfilment of that purpose—and that on a grander scale than the past has known or than the present can foresee, save in the symbolism of poetry and the visions of hope.

And it has one other characteristic. It traces the disasters of the present not to any weakening in the Divine Purpose, but to the failure of mankind to make any serious effort to attain to the moral ideal which its conscience has already recognized. If, then, it foresees a brighter future, this is not thought of as resulting from a mere automatic progress, an advance necessarily inherent in the nature of things. The new age will dawn only as a result of moral change and moral effort, especially among those who, from their position or abilities, are capable, whether by action or by the creation of a sounder public opinion, to effect the moral transformation of society.

> 'Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgement . . . And the eyes of them that see shall not be dim, and the ears of them that hear shall hearken. The heart also of the rash shall understand knowledge, and the tongue of the stammerers shall be ready to speak plainly. The vile person shall be no more called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful.' (Isaiah xxxii. 1-5.)

It was inevitable at that period that such optimism should be closely associated with both the national religion and the national destiny of the Hebrew people. Nor ought we to criticize it on this ground. Great as is the moral and material damage done by sectarianism and ultra-nationalism, the upward path for man, whether in regard to Church or State, will not be found by those who have ceased to have affection for their own Church or their own country and have given up the belief that these are capable, granted a change of heart, of contributing to humanity something specific and something of abiding value. And even if, at times, the nationalism of the Hebrew anticipates a Messianic age which begins with the annihilation or subjugation of the Gentile, the circumstances of the age were such as can be pleaded in condonation. The Assyrians who wiped out Ephraim and decimated Judah in the time of Isaiah have, by the atrocities towards conquered races, of which on

their own monuments they boast, held themselves up to posterity as the very type of inhumanity. The Babylonians who destroyed Jerusalem and deported into Mesopotamia the greater part of its population, though less savage than the Assyrians, were still a cruel race. If we can pardon a Belgian to-day for his hatred of the Prussians, we can understand, if not approve, the Hebrew when he associates together 'The day of vengeance was in mine heart' and 'The year of my redeemed is come.'

But the remarkable and the creative thing in the Messianic Hope, in the form it now took, is, not that it was occasionally associated with the spirit of nationalist vengeance, but the fact that it so often rose above it. The notable thing is that, in spite of the treatment the nation had received, so many looked forward to an international millenium, resulting from the world's acceptance of that ethical monotheism for which Zion stood.

> 'And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge between the nations, and shall reprove many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' (Is. ii, 2-4.)

Again, considering the part played in the national memory by the tradition of Egyptian bondage and the atrocious barbarities which, on the evidence of their own inscriptions, the Assyrians had inflicted, it would be hard to find a parallel to the ethical sublimity of a national ideal which could state itself in the words of another passage.

> 'In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth: for that the Lord of hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance.' (Is. xix. 24-25.)

A survey of the development of Messianic Prophecy and of its contribution to human thought would be incomplete which stopped short with the Old Testament and did not also consider the new ideas which in the two centuries before Christ came in with Apocalyptic literature—a literature of which the *Book of Enoch*, a book referred to in the *Epistle of St. Jude*

and still regarded as canonical in the Ethiopic Church, is perhaps the most interesting specimen. Here it will be legitimate to select for emphasis only three ideas which subsequent development proved to be on the high road of the evolution of religion.

In the first place it is interesting to note that, like Mr. H. G. Wells, who in every other respect, both in culture and in temperament, is their antithesis, the Apocalyptic writers envisage the Messianic kingdom no longer as a national, but as a world, state.

Secondly, they endeavour to enrich the traditional conception of the Messianic age in such a way as to provide a solution to the problem of individual as well as of national destiny, by teaching a real and fully personal immortality, under the figure, ultimately derived from Zoroastrianism, of the resurrection of the dead. There is in Apocalyptic literature no single and accepted picture of the future, but it takes its most interesting form in the doctrine of the temporary kingdom of the Messiah on earth—an earth rehabilitated by supernatural influence—to be terminated by a resurrection of the righteous dead, who then, along with those who have participated in the Messianic kingdom, will be sublimated into an eternal life in a heavenly sphere. This conception, commonly known as millenarianism, is re-affirmed in the book of the Revelation of St. John, and was probably in the main accepted by St. Paul. The form, of course, in which apocalytic writers state the idea is more nearly akin to dream symbolism than to rational philosophy; but millenarianism holds up before the human mind a double ideal: first that of a perfected world-wide society on earth, and secondly that of an individual immortality, also of a social character, in another sphere. As Mr. Edwyn Bevan has recently pointed out,[1] even if millenarianism were not the only form of apocalyptic eschatology clearly to be found in the New Testament, we should judge it the one which, once granted the necessity in that age of using what to us is a cumbrous and artificial symbolism, is in its broad outline the most consonant with the spirit of the religious and ethical teaching of our Lord.

Thirdly, in Apocalyptic, the person of the Messiah, where

[1] Cf. *Hellenism and Christianity*, ch. xi.

he is mentioned at all, takes on a more exalted style. The 'Son of Man,' by which title He is known in the Book of Enoch, is no longer one of a line of kings or even the most distinguished of the line; He is a being wholely unique, occurring once for all in history, the instrument of the moral reformation upon which the new world state is to be rebuilt, the last word, so to speak, of God to man.

> 'Yea, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were made, His name was named before the Lord of Spirits. He will be a staff to the righteous on which they will support themselves and not fall, and He will be the light of the Gentiles and the hope of those who are troubled in heart. All who dwell on earth will fall down and bow the knee before Him, and will praise and bless and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits' (Enoch xlviii, 3-5).

The traditional argument from Messianic prophecy—for the continual re-statement of which the pious founder of this sermon was concerned—depended for its cogency on the demonstration that such and such things were foretold long before, and just those things subsequently occurred. In the narrower sense, as I have already pointed out, the argument has lost its cogency; but if we look rather to broader issues, there are certain outstanding ways in which the fundamental optimism of the prophets has been justified by history.

> 'Thus saith the Lord of hosts,' says Zechariah: 'It *shall* yet *come to pass,* that there shall come peoples, and the inhabitants of many cities: and the inhabitants of one *city* shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to intreat the favour of the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts: I will go also. Yea, many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to intreat the favour of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts: In those days *it shall come to pass*, that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.' (Zech. viii, 20-23.)

It was in a period of intense national depression that these words of Zechariah were written. The glorious return from exile, prophesied by Jeremiah and the second Isaiah, had apparently taken place—but it had not been glorious. A few stragglers only had returned, and these, in a desolate city threatened with famine after an unexpected drought, had not as yet even made a beginning of the rebuilding of the Temple. Jerusalem is a city never very important, now for a century in ruins. Jehovah seems the ineffective God of a wholly insigni-

ficant tribe among the multitude of subject races in the Persian Empire, which stretched from the borders of India to the desert of Cyrene, and all but engulfed the peninsula of Greece. But look forward two thousand years, and it is literally true that the most powerful peoples of the earth are singing the praises of this ineffective God, and Jerusalem has become the Holy City for half the world.

Think next of Pompey the Great receiving the submission of Jerusalem, and inquiring curiously into the Temple and religious institutions of this quaint people, whom he was incorporating in the Roman world as the possessors of a mountain fortress on the marches of the world state. They may have told him of this expectation of a Son of Man who would be a staff to the righteous, a light to the Gentiles, and the hope of those who are troubled in heart, before whom all who dwell on earth will fall down and bow the knee. More probably they thought it prudent not to obtrude this feature of their faith upon his notice. If they had done so he would just have smiled. But had he come back to earth again after some fifteen hundred years, though he would not have been surprised to find Rome still an imperial city giving laws and leadership to the kingdoms of the earth, he would have been dumbfounded to realize that now she did so in the name, and nominally in the service, of that Son of Man, and was destined to forfeit that position only because, in the opinion of humanity, that service was insufficiently sincere.

Once again, consider. The nations of the world have not yet beaten their swords into plough-shares and their spears into pruning-hooks; but two things have become patent to all thinking men. First, unless the nations can somehow contrive to do this, and that at no very distant date, civilization cannot survive. Secondly, the only prospect of mankind being able to agree to such disarmament lies in the penetration of public opinion in the great nations to far greater extent than hitherto by those ethical principles which the prophets sketched in outline, and to which the Christ, who claimed to be the fulfilment of their prophecies, gave a clear expression.

But such a result will be brought about, neither by the happy optimism which believes in automatic progress, nor by the pes-

simism which declines to believe that human institutions can be substantially bettered or human nature permanently inspired. The better age will either come soon, or will be indefinitely delayed, according as there are present or are absent in the leaders of human thought three things. First, the Faith that there is a Divine purpose in history which man can co-operate with or can impede, but mere belief in which is in itself the first and most important step towards such co-operation. Secondly, the Hope that can take long views and, on occasion, great risks. Thirdly, the Charity that strenuously endeavours in thought, word and deed, to realize the brotherhood of man. Faith, Hope and Charity, these three. The greatest of these is Charity, but the one we most need to emphasize to-day is Hope.

MODERNISM AND AUTHORITY

By the Rev. Francis E. Powell, M.A., Rector of Ladbroke, Co-Editor of *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers.*

I. *Authority and Truth.*

1. Of all appeals in our day, that to mere authority seems the most hopeless. The only arguments to which men will listen are those drawn from fact, from experience, and from history which is merely the continuous experience of nations. P. Gardner.

2. Even should piety suffer there is a still more important interest than that of piety—that of truth. A. Harnack.

3. We realize the scandal given by the Greek to the barbarian; we do not realize the scandal given by the barbarian to the Greek. Where prudence and veracity conflict, the latter is to be preferred; we must follow the lead of thought, take us where it will. For no seeming good may we tamper with evidence or play fast and loose with fact. A. Fawkes.

4. It may be objected that there is a legitimate domain for authority, consisting of doctrines which lie outside human experience, and therefore cannot be proved or verified, but at the same time cannot be disproved. Of course, any number of

propositions can be invented which cannot be disproved, and it is open to anyone who possesses exuberant faith to believe them; but no one will maintain that they all deserve credence so long as their falsehood is not demonstrated. And if only some deserve credence, who, except reason, is to decide which? If the reply is, Authority, we are confronted by the difficulty that many beliefs backed by authority have been finally disproved and are universally abandoned. Yet some people speak as if we were not justified in rejecting a theological doctrine unless we can prove it false. But the burden of proof does not lie upon the rejecter . . . If you were told that in a certain planet revolving round Sirius there is a race of donkeys who talk the English language and spend their time in discussing eugenics, you could not disprove the statement, but would it, on that account, have any claim to be believed? Some minds would be prepared to accept it if it were reiterated often enough, through the potent force of suggestion. J. B. Bury.

5. Authority is the imperativeness of the collective conscience. George Tyrrell.

6. What you have inherited from your fathers you must earn for yourself before you can call it yours. Goethe.

7. No error has ever spread widely that was not the exaggeration of a truth. The first step towards dislodging error is to understand the truth at which it aims. Never can an error be permanently destroyed unless we have planted by its side the truth that is to take its place. Anon.

8. Truth is the daughter of Time. Francis Bacon.

9. Truth always and everywhere is a sacred trust from God for the service of man. Aubrey Moore.

10. It makes all the difference in the world whether we place Truth first or second. Archbishop Whateley.

II. *Authority and Religion.*

1. We need to grasp the all-unifying, all-clarifying idea that knowledge of every kind is nothing less than an impartation to the human consciousness of a portion of that Eternal

Reason which is the ground and source of all being. What is the guarantee that any opinion we may hold is true? The answer is in its agreement with facts, as witnessed by the highest consciousness of the race. The fact that this common consciousness tends in its findings evermore to unity is one of the surest proofs we have that the individual mind derives from, and rests upon, one Universal Mind, in which all truth inheres; that human progress and enlightenment mean simply the inflowing upon man to an ever-increasing degree of its radiance. The reception of this light is revelation, of which the truth in the Scriptures in one part as the truth of Science is another . . . When theology understands this there will be no more building on the boggy acre of Dualism, on which so many rickety structures have hitherto been reared; and religious truth, resting on the same basis as that of science, will receive the same universal acceptance. J. Brierley.

2. The ultimate authority is God Himself. The Mind of God is Absolute Truth, His Will is Absolute Good, His Nature is Absolute Beauty. This is the conviction of the religious consciousness . . . We are so constituted that the true commands the assent of our reason, the good of our conscience, the beautiful of our sense of beauty, in so far as we perceive them. They are to us the very expression of the Divine Being and have therefore absolute authority for us, since we are made in the Divine Image. If we deliberately reject them, we know in our hearts that we are rebels. But we cannot discern unaided the True, the Good, and the Beautiful; since he is human and humanity is an organic unity, he cannot dispense with the general human experience . . . This general experience is summed up for him by those whom he calls 'authorities,' *i.e.* those who seem to his Reason, Conscience, and sense of Beauty, to be experts. The Specialist is the expert in some department of Truth, the Saint in the Good, the Artist in the Beautiful.
R. F. Cardale.

3. The seat of authority in religion has been shifted. In the ultimate analysis, if you go down deep enough into your self and ask: Why do I believe? you will find that your real reason, for all your real belief, is *experience*. You believe a

thing to be true, because you have found it to be true. Of course the authority of religion was not always this experience. Men were content to believe because of the decisions of Councils, or the traditions of the Church. And no doubt there are some who still lean, and need to lean, on this external authority . . . What we accept upon external authority produces a very different effect, and is a very different thing from that which we accept from the deepest conviction that it meets our spiritual needs, responds to our highest aspirations, and can stand the test of experience. W. MANNING.

4. The only sound basis for Church Authority to-day is that which the apostles claimed in their first Council at Jerusalem, *viz.* the possession of the Spirit of Christ (Acts xv, 28) . . . . The measure of the Church's authority is the measure of the Church's service. It is internal, not external. It wins and leads and inspires. It does not compel and rule, neither does it anathematize or excommunicate. H. D. A. MAJOR.

5. The teachers of faith have power, not by virtue of rank or office, but by experience of things eternal . . . For by its very nature, authority in matters of faith and morals rests in God, and as far as it is entrusted to men is not official or arbitrary, but spiritual and persuasive. FORT NEWTON.

6. The decrees of Nicaea were not universally accepted at the time, and there are still Nestorian or Monophysite Churches, which can only be ruled out by defining 'Church' as the body of Christians which accepts the (so-called) Œcumenical Councils. HASTINGS RASHDALL.

7. The only sure basis for religion is experience.
SCHLEIERMACHER.

III. *Liberty and Private Judgment.*

1. The establishment of the perfect liberty of thought and discussion may be considered the most valuable achievement of modern civilization, and as a condition of social progress it should be deemed fundamental . . . The considerations of permanent utility on which it rests must outweigh any calcu-

lations of present advantage which from time to time might be thought to demand its violation . . . It would be absurd to deny that liberty of speech may sometimes cause particular harm. Every good thing sometimes does harm. Government, for instance, which makes fatal mistakes; law, which so often bears hardly and inequitably in individual cases.

J. B. Bury.

2. There is the greatest difference between assuming an opinion to be true, because with every opportunity for contesting it it has not been refuted, and assuming its truth for the purpose of not permitting its refutation. Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action, and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right. J. S. Mill.

3. All creeds, in the last resort, appeal to private judgment. The Roman Catholic calls on us to exercise our judgment, and to choose his Church, leaving all others. G. G. Coulton.

4. Candid Roman controversialists have always admitted that the individual has to use his private judgment to decide upon the claims of the Church. Hastings Rashdall.

5. We used to rely upon assumptions; now we criticize them. Anon.

6. A living and effective protest must be maintained in the name of the future against the tyrannous inertia of the past. The present is older and wiser and better than the past which it incorporates and transcends. Anon.

IV. *The Misuse of Authority.*

1. The Catholic Church claims not only to judge infallibly on religious questions, but to animadvert on opinions in secular matters which bear upon religion, on matters of philosophy, of science, of literature, of history; and it demands our submission to this claim. It claims to censure books, to silence authors, and to forbid discussions . . . It must of course be obeyed without a word. J. H. Newman.

2. Those rites and doctrines which have made most noise in the Roman Controversy (Images, Purgatory, Masses, &c.) are those which are the least of the essence of Romanism . . . The one essential principle of the Catholic system is the control of the individual conscience by an authority, or law, placed without it, and exercised by men assuming to act in the name of heaven. MARK PATTISON.

3. Freedom is in the last resort inevitable, because the nature of mind is what it is. It cannot be holden. The principle of Authority promises great things—truth, certainty, unity. But it promises only—it cannot perform. It cannot inspire religious belief, for in religion we possess only what we have made our own. Belief is experience; an element of experience, at least, enters into belief. And experience must be experienced; a proposition shot at us, like a bullet from a pistol, remains a foreign body outside consciousness and external to the self. A. FAWKES.

4. The range of human vision contains few things more unsightly than the withered symbols out of which the life has gone. The human loathing of cant is its healthy horror of skeletons, of carcases, of decayed things generally. Men shrink more and more from religious functions that are stuffed with defunct phrases . . . When the Church has these things mainly to offer, men will keep outside. Within they scent the odour of putrefaction, and they prefer the fresh air.

J. BRIERLEY.

5. Credulity is as real, if not so great, a sin as unbelief.

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH.

6. The only real tyrants that humanity has known have always been the memories of its dead, or the illusions it has forged for itself.

LE BON.

BOOK NOTICES

A JESUIT ON REUNION *

The Alchemists, who set out to discover the Philosopher's Stone, did not find it; but, without intending to do so, they made more useful discoveries, and laid the foundations of modern chemistry. The case of Father Walker is, in some respects, similar to theirs. The lines on which his convictions and his position compel him to work will not lead to what is generally understood by Reunion; for Rome, reunion is a euphemism for submission. But the temper of these essays is that of an eirenicon: it differs as much from that of the *Tablet* as—shall we say?—that of the *Modern Churchman* differs from that of the *Church Times*. It is probable that, as the *Church Times* is more representative of actual Anglicanism than the *Modern Churchman*, so the *Tablet* is a more accurate exponent of actual Roman Catholicism than Father Walker. But it is also probable that both Churches have potentialities as yet imperfectly realized; and that, in proportion as these are developed, a better understanding between their respective members may be brought about.

His repudiation of the principle of persecution is explicit:—

> 'In this twentieth century we look with horror upon the methods by which our forefathers sought to maintain their faith. The severity of the laws that were passed by Catholics against heresy, and by Protestants against Catholics, the terrible persecutions that ensued, the cruelty that characterized a century of religious war, are nowadays regarded by everyone as the deplorable result of misguided zeal.'

He insists on the good faith of Protestants—'we are convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt of the sincerity of our fellow-Christians'—and does not deny that the Reformers themselves were animated by a genuine zeal for righteousness:—

> 'They were not saints; far from it. But, since Protestants are convinced of their good faith, and hold that in seeking righteousness they were perfectly sincere, so be it. Some of them were at any rate far better than others; and to all the claims of charity must extend.'

Nor was the Reformation without a cause:—

> 'It is hard to read the history of the Church and not to be staggered by the evils that seem sometimes to have held her in their grip. There have been bad popes, worse cardinals and bishops, disgraceful lives among the clergy, high and low, secular and regular. There have been bigots, persecutors, tyrants; there have been worldliness, greed, and unedifying diplomacy.'

While, except in matters of faith, Rome is not necessarily irreformable:

> 'Not all that the Catholic Church inculcates or practices falls under the head of revealed truth, or implies the exercise of infallibility; celibacy, *e.g.*, communion in one kind, the use of a dead language in the liturgy, fasting, lay preaching, lay representation in synods and councils. . . . Convince the Church that the disadvantages of clerical celibacy, from the Christian point of view, outweigh the advantages, and she would unquestionably modify her practice.'

* *The Problem of Reunion discussed historically in Seven Essays*, by Leslie Walker, S.J., M.A. Longmans, 1920. 12/6.

And with regard to the Reformation, mistaken as he believes it to have been :—

> 'As Catholics, we do not deny that in places serious scandals existed. Nor do we deny that there was urgent need of a Reformation. Neither do we repudiate all that the Reformers taught—their esteem for the Bible, *e.g.*, or their confidence in God's power. Nor, yet again, do we assert that the methods of reforming discipline which were adopted by Zwingli and Calvin are hopelessly irreconcilable with Catholic principles. The sole point on which we are utterly and irredeemably intransigent is the question of faith. There we claim that the Protestant remedy was radically wrong.'

This was a possible position in the sixteenth century; and, had the Papacy admitted it, the unity of the Church might have been temporarily preserved. It could scarcely have been so permanently. Can we doubt that the Rationalism of the eighteenth century, and the critical movement of the nineteenth, would either have burst the old formulas, or reinterpreted them in the sense of what is known as Modernism? And, for Father Walker, 'Modernism is an attempt to reconstruct Christianity on a new basis—that of experience,' and incompatible with what he understands by faith.

Unlike religious journalists, he is under no illusion as to the moral and religious results of the war. There has been no revival, nor is there any sign of one : we 'looked for judgment, but behold shedding of blood; and for righteousness, but behold a cry.' The reunion of the Churches is an inadequate remedy for these evils. 'Say unto them that daub it with untempered mortar that it shall fall . . . and ye shall be consumed in the midst thereof, and ye shall know that I am the Lord.' He is more hopeful, however, than those directly concerned with regard to the proposals of the recent Lambeth Conference in this direction. 'The Free Churches can re-unite,' he thinks, 'with Anglicans on the basis of a remodelled episcopacy without sacrifice of principle, and in so doing will be gaining a victory. . . . One hopes that they will, if by this means Catholic reunion would draw nearer; and the Anglican Church, as a *Via Media* between truth and the more extreme forms of negation, may possibly be able to help towards this end. But ultimately nothing but the whole truth will suffice, and nothing short of that can endure; and the whole truth can neither come, nor endure, except in the way Christ has appointed'—that is to say by the full acceptance of the faith of the Roman Church. A Roman Catholic can, of course, hold no other view. But it follows that a Roman Catholic cannot speak, in any real sense of the word, of Reunion. It is strange that a writer of the high mental and moral qualities displayed by the author of these essays does not see the absolute impossibility of the Reformed Churches, or the modern mind, accepting the standards of Roman Catholicism; that he should be blind to the fact that it is simply not in the nature of things. 'The Reformers (he argues) were wrong in attributing unrighteousness to false doctrine.' Unrighteousness is due to no one cause; its root is in the heart : and, if the Reformers thought that a reform of doctrine would be directly or necessarily followed by a reform of morals, they were, no doubt, in a very great error. But wrong belief is, at least, a *part* cause of wrong doing : and though to 'speak gently of our sister's fall' is the dictate both of humility—for what Church is without blame?—and of charity, that there is much in Catholic belief which can only be described as false and mischievous, can only be denied by those who, however

estimable and well-informed in certain subject-matter they may be, are content to remain outside the human mind-movement; and—'the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord.' Speaking of the man of genius, who, more than any divine of his generation, left his mark on Catholic thought, Roman and Anglican alike, Pattison says acutely:—

> 'Newman assumed and adorned the narrow basis on which Laud had stood 200 years before. All the grand development of the human reason, from Aristotle down to Hegel, was a sealed book to him. There lay a unity, a unity of all thought, which far transcended the mere mechanical association of the unthinking members of the Catholic Church; a great spiritual unity, by the side of which all sects and denominations shrink into vanity.' (*Memoirs*, p. 210.)

Home Reunion is another matter. There are many reasons for it, and none (except of the *festina lente* order) against it: it has, indeed, already in great measure been brought about. Father Walker's information on this subject seems to have come from sources rather official than reliable. Certainly his perspective is faulty. Professor Cooper is a distinguished man, but he has little or no following in Scotland; Dr. Orchard is an eminent preacher, but it would be difficult to find any one less representative of Nonconformity. The more the Lambeth proposals are examined, the less satisfactory they appear to be; they commend themselves neither to the Bishop of Durham nor to the Editor of the *Church Times*.

Much confusion of thought would be avoided if, for the loose word Reunion, the more exact phrase *communicatio in sacris* were substituted. For the reunion, or union, of Christians which is to be desired is not a fusion, or even a coalition, of churches; it would not touch the polity, the ceremonial, the fundamental beliefs, or (what is more important) the distinctive spirit, or genius, of any one of the Churches concerned. Nor would it involve, directly or indirectly, a national or international organization of Christians into one visible body. Such an organization, useful in one stage of civilization, might be mischievous in another: in our own time it could scarcely fail to produce friction between civil and religious society, and to exaggerate differences of outlook into diversities of principle. The union, the need for which is coming home so strongly to the wisest and best men in all the Churches, is a unity of spirit. A Roman Catholic writer is naturally apt to suppose that the word 'Church' is used in the Reformed Churches in the same sense which it bears in his own. It is not so. 'Why do the Churches each preach a different Christianity?' asks Father Walker. They do not; no Protestant ever imagined it for a moment. And unity is not broken when one man attends one place of worship, and another another; it is not broken when people hold different views as to the nature of the Church, the functions of the ministry, the operation of the Sacraments, or the character of what we may call the Christian facts. The Gospel is above such differences. The mischief begins when Christians 'bite and devour one another' because of them: heresy is a temper, not an opinion; schism is a state of mind, not a relationship. The scandal of the separatist temper has always been felt; and is no doubt one, though far from the only, cause of the loss of hold of religion on the world of to-day. But the ferment of ideas consequent upon the war—a ferment to which that of the French Revolution is the closest modern parallel—has made it acute. Even the clergy are coming to recognize this. In that important book *The Army and Religion* (Macmillan, 1919) chaplain after chaplain assures us that the soldier—who, when you come to know him, is a very average human being, and

has often more shrewdness and common sense than some of us who belong to what are called the learned professions—simply cannot understand religious antiquarianism.

'The doctrinal message of the Churches is unintelligible. The men do not know what it is all about.'

'Why (they ask) should we be taught as children things which, when we are grown up, we find to be untrue?'

'In a chaplain personality goes for everything; Orders for nothing.'

'The Church is regarded as feminine'—*i.e.*, as an old woman in the contemptuous sense of the word (pp. 195, 201, 226, 230).

And the idea that Christians should refuse to pray together, to hear the Word of God together, or to receive communion together, seems to him scandalous and ridiculous. He is right: it is both, and it is time that this state of things came to an end.

Some not very wise people—Father Walker, we have seen, is not one of them—demur to inter-communion with our sister Churches of the Reformation for fear that it should prejudice our relations with our distant cousins the Churches of the East and the Church of Rome. Well, a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. We know very little about the Eastern Churches, except that such Western influences as have reached them are Protestant, not Catholic. The case of the Patriarch Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638) is an instance; and any infiltrations that have come in since then, superficial as they may be, have been of the same character. The mind of these Churches is inarticulate; but, when they look beyond their own borders, it is not to Rome, and still less to Lambeth; but to Tübingen, Glasgow, or Berlin. While what the *Church Times* sometimes speaks of as 'the great and venerable Church of Rome'—I do not dispute the propriety of either epithet, though the fathers of Anglicanism described her in less complimentary terms—shows herself to us *non parens, sed noverca.* Her arm is, happily, shortened by the Reformation, and by the Royal Supremacy—*i.e.*, the supremacy of the law—to which some of us are so ungrateful, but on which our civil and religious liberties—shall we say our 'Life and Liberty?'—rest. We have had enough of Conferences and Round Tables. What good can come of them? What common ground is there between those who hold that Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church, and those who regard it as matter of circumstances and expediency. One respects people, however much one may differ from them, if one knows where to find them. One can understand 'Yes,' or 'No'; but a policy of 'Yes, and No' leaves an impression of insincerity. Nothing will be done till individuals take the bull by the horns. One act of inter-communion—such as the Bishop of Hereford's Bournemouth sermon, or Dr. McClymont's communion and sermon at Durham—is of more value than many encyclicals. We shall not be heard for our 'much speaking'; it is the deed that tells.

The differences between the Free Churches and our own are political, historical, and cultural, not religious: and, as Philip Henry reminds us, 'it is not the actual differences among Christians that do the mischief; it is the mismanagement of these differences.' Is not the scholar the true Pontifex, or bridge-builder? For, to adapt Selden's wise saying, scholars 'have ever been more temperate in their religion than the common people, as having more reason—the others running in a hurry.' It is the misfortune of the Church of England, once reputed to be the most learned Church in Christendom, that of late years it has been

administered by persons, lay as well as clerical, rather of the latter than of the former type. We owe the Dissenters much; and, with all its limitations, the Nonconformist conscience is a power for good among us with which we could ill dispense. These vigorous Churches can supply us with the backbone in which, as a Church, we are somehow lacking—the foolish playing at Popery which has become the fashion among a small section of Nonconformists has no future; we can give them background, and a certain counterbalance to the sectionalism which is the weakness of small religious societies. While, if we ask what we and they alike have to learn from the unreformed Churches, the answer is 'much every way.' But not dogmas, not polity, not ceremonial—rather Latin sense of form, and Greek tenacity; and, above all, the European as distinct from the provincial mind. Meanwhile we dwell among our own people. Is it too much to think that the time has at last come when Dean Stanley's noble and truly Christian aspiration may be realized?

> 'Let us hope that the estrangement between us, which has doubtless of late years greatly diminished, may altogether cease; and that we may more and more learn to treat our Dissenting brethren as our friends, our equals, and our allies—in one word, as "Nonconforming members and ministers of the National Church."' (*Essays on Church and State*, p. 369.)

ALFRED FAWKES.

A STATESMAN BISHOP.*

The Bishop of Manchester has done what was not an easy work with sympathy and judgment. The distinguished man of whom it is a record occupied a somewhat solitary position; and belonged in certain respects to a past, in others to a future, age. He was, perhaps, more like a good man than a clergyman. Not, of course, that these classes are mutually exclusive, but that their perspectives differ. He had a passion for righteousness, but he was indifferent to the questions that generally interest the clergy, and saw them from another than the clerical point of view; while his religious outlook was rather that of a well-informed and reasonable man than of a theologian. His studies had not been on theological lines; and his busy life as a headmaster had brought him into contact rather with men and affairs than with speculation. And, while this made his intervention in Convocation and other clerical debating societies like the opening of a window in a stuffy room, it put him at a certain disadvantage: he was not at home in their air.

He had the good fortune to find his vocation, which was that of a teacher, in early life. Even now, in no way can a man serve his generation to better purpose. But two generations ago English education was on a lower than its present level. Few Englishmen were educated at all; and those who were educated were badly educated. They were taught the wrong things, and taught them inadequately; the atmosphere was one of prejudice, not of ideas. There is still room—those who have the best means of knowing tell us that there is great room—for improvement. But at least we are aware of our deficiencies. Then there was little notion that anything needed to be, or could be, improved; and the reformer came into collision with ignorance, indifference, and, above all, with vested interests on every side. Percival's aims were efficiency and economy. 'His Clifton staff was one of the most brilliant ever gathered together at any school,' says Bishop Temple; and later, at Oxford, 'He was an object of suspicion and anxiety because of his well-known desire to make the University accessible to poor students, and especially to working men.'

**Life of Bishop Percival*, by William Temple, Bishop of Manchester. Macmillan. 18s.

How strong this desire was is shown by his proposal, in 1882, to resign his Headship—he was then President of Trinity—for the office of Censor of the Unattached. His wish was to modernize both the Public Schools and the Universities, bringing them into a comprehensive scheme of national education. This was a revolution; but it was a revolution which was also a reconstruction on historical lines. Designed for the poor, the old foundations had been 'enclosed,' like the common lands, by the rich; reform was, in fact, reversion to type.

Percival's temper was that of an autocrat; and he was too exacting to be, in the common sense of the word, popular. And he could be hubristic: 'We felt,' said Bishop Gore, then a Fellow of Trinity, 'that a great, strong, righteous will was expressing itself among us with profound astonishment at our being content to be such fools as we were; and this was to me very bracing.' On some a different impression was left. 'Do you like Percival's sermons? I can't bear them,' said one of his assistant masters at Clifton to another. 'Why not?' 'I dislike being kicked.' 'No doubt you do; but he's always trying to kick you upstairs; and that is something.' If, however, he was exacting with others, he was more so with himself: since Arnold no one else has done so much for Public School education; and, coming a generation later, he was able to accentuate the modern note which Arnold had been the first to strike.

At Oxford he laid stress rather on the note of education than on that of research, regarding a University 'as primarily concerned with turning out men who would truly serve the nation.' Here he stood with Jowett, and against Pattison. The quarrel is an ancient and, perhaps, an unsolved one. 'There are no such enemies to learning as the educationalists,' is a remark attributed to a stalwart of the latter school, whose advice to a college tutor was, 'Don't you start working for your pupils. If you once start working for your pupils, there's no end to it.' Percival's moral earnestness, which was the dominant note in his character, made dilettantism of this kind repulsive to him; the maxim of the scholastics *Bonum est diffusivum sui* was his guide. Nor did he confine it to the province of education:—

> 'He took an active, and even vehement, part in general politics. But it was always with what seemed to him definitely moral issues that he concerned himself. He often regarded as a matter of moral principle what was to most men a matter of expediency; and his general outlook led him as a rule to claim moral sanction for the Liberal solution of the question in hand.'

His advocacy of Liquor Reform was the more effective because he was not a total abstainer; he introduced legislation, unfortunately without success, against 'spurious sport' and gambling advertisements; Free Trade was for him at once a principle and an axiom:—

> 'For my own part I look upon this retrograde agitation with the hard-hearted policy of preferences, combinations, trusts and corners, which it subserves, as the newest form of that oppression of the poorer and weaker classes which every minister of the Gospel is bound to oppose, if he truly understands his vocation and responsibility.'

And:—

> 'Every labouring man who may be induced or persuaded to give his vote for any advocate of these Chamberlainite proposals can, it is to be feared, only be said to be a fool for his pains.'

His attitude towards the Labour Party was at once sympathetic and critical; he approved of their aims, but was often in opposition to their

methods: he was not, frequently as he was accused of being so, in any sense a party man.

In 1895 Lord Rosebury proposed his name to the Crown for the See of Hereford. If this choice represents the principle of selection by which this elusive personality would have recruited the episcopate, the Church has suffered from the shortness of his tenure of office; had he continued to lead the Liberal Party, English religion might have been in a stronger position than it is to-day. His successors acted on other lines. As a bishop, he was to a great extent isolated. 'He honoured his clergy, taken singly, for their devotion and ungrudging labours; but he had no high opinion of the clergy as a whole, whether in his diocese or out of it.' And he seems to have viewed the bishops in the same light: in 1898 he writes:—

> 'We seem to do little but mark time. But I hope to press it home to some of my brother Bishops that it is not quite creditable to be such friends with the E.C.U. and *Church Times*, and to submit so tamely to their mode of governing the Church by arrogant bluff and bullying. It will be interesting to know how the Bishops take it.'

They were 'not taking any': in Convocation he was generally in a minority, often a minority of one. On Archbishop Maclagan's resignation (1909), his translation to York was expected. It would have been a recognition, though a very tardy one, of his services—the more natural because a Liberal Government was then in office; and it would have strengthened the position both of religion and of the Church in this country. He had still considerable power of work; he would, indeed, have been more in his place as an Archbishop than as a diocesan bishop; and he believed that at York 'he would have been able to bring the Church into living contact both with the new Universities and with the great centres of the Labour movement.' But he was neither mediocre nor pliable; he possessed a certain Puritan austerity of outlook; he did not 'suffer fools gladly'; and he was probably thought too big and too uncompromising a man for the greater Sees. His presence on the bench was, however, a protest against the curious ineffectiveness which characterizes English religion. Thoughtful men sit loose to the Churches; the half-educated go off into childish superstition or shallow scepticism; while more mischievous and more offensive than either is the convention which would enforce a double standard both of knowledge and of veracity —the one for the clerical, the other for the lay mind. This convention is a novelty among us; and with Bishop Percival one of the most conspicuous and consistent representatives of the older tradition disappeared. A.F.

HELLENISM AND CHRISTIANITY.*

One approaches a book having this title, and coming from the author of *The House of Seleucus* and *Jerusalem under the High Priests*, with the highest expectations. But instead of a fresh piece of historical reconstruction we discover a collection of essays, literary, historical, theological, and *quasi*-philosophical; and the result is, on the whole, perhaps a little disappointing; for in the spheres of philosophy and theology, Mr. Bevan, though interesting and suggestive, can make no claim to introduce us to any original ideas, nor even to present us with old ideas in an original form.

Yet, as indeed one would expect, Mr. Bevan gives his readers something to stimulate both thought and imagination; the following passage

* *Hellenism and Christianity*, by Edwyn Bevan. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 12/6 net.

from an essay on the relationship of Christianity to Pagan Gnosticism is true and vigorous.

> 'Even at first sight the Gospel must have presented in some ways a striking contrast to "Hellenistic theology." It must have seemed such a simplification. Instead of the enormous apparatus of mystical words and ceremonial practices, to believe that in order to conquer all possible terrors of the Unknown, the whole range of ghostly enemies, one needed only to know Jesus! It must have been like the lifting off of a burden to say "I believe in One God."'

In the essay on St. Augustine, entitled *The Prophet of Personality*, Mr. Bevan is at his best. After showing that Augustine's Latin is a fit vehicle for intense religious emotion—capable of expressing depths of feeling unknown to the heart, and to the pen, of Cicero, the essayist reminds us of the psychological insight of the author of the *Confessions*:

> 'How enormously the Christian's perception of the psychological problem went beyond the wisdom of the ancient schools! How much that had once seemed so easy to read off, so distinct and simple and classifiable, was found to be dim and complicated and infinitely mysterious?' "The abysmal depths of personality"—it was Augustine who first gave men an inkling of what that meant. The very phrase is his—"*abyssus humanae conscientiae*"' (p. 139).

Another notable passage may be found in the essay, *A Paradox of Christianity*; of which the theme is the old one of Pascal's that we must select our religion on the same principle that we make our bets.

> 'If each human life is really only a momentary phenomenon, then man is really a much smaller thing than he had supposed, and nothing in human life really does matter very much. Life really is comparatively trivial, and it is ridiculous to make such a fuss about it. . . . On the other hand, if the Christian view is true, if upon this life hang eternal issues for the eternal spirit, then man's sense of his greatness and of the high seriousness of life is in accordance with reality. . . . There is no denying it. Christianity makes men set their all upon an "if." . . . We, to whom hedging is congenial, find ourselves confronted with an inexorable necessity of choice. . . . An old Christian writer, rehearsing the traditional types of spiritual greatness, finds that the characteristic of all was "faith," and that "faith" was just this abandonment of near and certain and palpable goods for the sake of a good invisible, hypothetical. . . . They all elected to give up this life. . . . Behind the one bowed Figure of Jesus we may see the long lines of other agonizers for the Ideal, the immeasurable volume of pain taken by men upon themselves voluntarily, because the souls of men seemed to them worth that' (pp. 154 ff.).

There we have the essence of Christianity described in the same terms as those in which Stevenson interpreted the message of the way-side crucifix at the end of *Olalla*:

> I looked on the face of the crucifix, and . . . some sense of what the thing implied was carried home to my intelligence. The face looked down upon me with a painful and deadly contraction, but the rays of a glory encircled it, and reminded me that the sacrifice was voluntary. It stood there, as it still stands on many highway sides, vainly preaching to passers-by, an emblem of sad and noble truths; that pleasure is not an end but an accident; that pain is the choice of the magnanimous; that it is best to suffer all things and do well.'

J.C.H.

SIN AND PSYCHOLOGY.*

This is the kind of book that is worth writing and worth reading. Theological problems, if they are to be handled profitably, must be handled historically. We cannot know what to think, until we know what others have already thought, and the reasons that inspired their opinions. Mere vague *a priori* chatter is waste of time.

Here we have an historical treatment of the Christian view of sin. Mr. Moxon deals successively with the doctrine of sin as held in the first four centuries, carries it on through Pelagianism, Augustinianism, and Semi-pelagianism to the Scholastic and Mediaeval period, and thence to more recent times, finally devoting a chapter to sin as analysed by the New Psychology.

The book may be described, we hope not unjustly, as an attack on Augustinianism. That sinister doctrine of Original Sin and the imputation of Adam's transgression to his posterity 'rests upon the very slenderest foundation of N.T. authority' (p. 17). 'The Apostolic Fathers are silent on the subject,' and 'after their time there was a considerable difference of opinion.' This divergence of view resolved itself into two main tendencies of thought: Eastern or Greek, and Western or Latin. The latter alone contained germs which developed (with the assistance of Tertullian) into the final and systematised dogma of Augustine:—

> 'The theory itself must be regarded as his own individual contribution, whether for better or for worse, to Christian theology, and it has no greater claim to be received than is derived from his personal authority' (p. 46).

Mr. Moxon, towards the close of his survey of the mediaeval period, makes the following observations:—

> 'The Augustinian anthropology, though triumphant at first in the West, was gradually superseded by the Semi-pelagian anthropology, which may be said to have had full sway in the Mediaeval Church. . . . At the Reformation, the Protestants, partly to widen the breach with Rome, and partly to support their special doctrine of Justification by faith, leaned towards Augustinianism, while the Roman Church, under Jesuit influence [perhaps the only recorded instance in history when the Jesuits have been on the right side] refused to abandon the Semi-pelagian position. . . . It is highly essential for the student to see where the deviation from primitive simplicity began. It began with Augustine himself, with his false and Manichaean views of Human Nature' (p. 174).

Passing by the chapter on the views of philosophers like Kant, S. T. Coleridge, Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Pfleiderer, and so on (this shows the exhaustive nature of Mr. Moxon's treatise), we come to the New Psychology. What is the neo-psychological view of sin?

> 'It is the being influenced by the sub-conscious instincts, tendencies, desires, and habits when the time has come to pass under the higher rule of reason and of conscience. The sub-conscious is primitive, and is that part of the mind which we share with lower animals—the seat of the instincts, passions, appetites. These are not wrong, for they cannot be dispensed with: we can no more do without them than without our senses' (p. 229).

* *The Doctrine of Sin*, by Reginald Stewart Moxon, B.D. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 10/6 net.

These natural instincts are the chief source of human energy—a potent force for good or evil. They cannot be ignored, and to repress them is to court disaster. 'Repression is essentially an evil thing which tends to throw the whole unconscious mind out of balance.' Church teaching in the past on these matters has been largely misdirected—'Christianity to-day is largely the residuum of fifty generations of pendants, who have done for the Gospel what their predecessors did for the prophets of Israel.' This purely negative attitude must be abandoned. Sublimation and not repression must be the method of conquest. The Christian method is that of altruism, and even the instinct of sex, which is the source of what is best in us, as well as of what is worst, may become altruistic in unselfish love, in the desire to foster and protect, and also in a sense or beauty and in artistic expression.

But is this Christianity? Yes, for

> 'The teaching of Christ, in fact if not explicitly, was based upon a value for the creative impulses and a hatred for everything that represses them. . . . Christianity combines a readiness to forgive with a very clear standard of ethical judgment; it is both judicial and pitiful, because it recognises that for the most part men know not what they do or what they are. The Christian religion is the only religion which tends to liberate energies capable of transforming the living soul into a quickening spirit. Its doctrine of love towards God and man harmonises the instincts with one inspiring purpose, thereby destroying a conflict of emotions, and by setting free instead of suppressing the full powers of mankind, gives man perfect freedom to perform the will of God' (p. 243).

We leave our readers in possession of these views. Having regard to the ineffectiveness of the other views, inculcated as they have so long been, with the greatest solemnity and pertinacity, the opinion seems to be growing that an entirely new method of investigation is necessary. The old exhortations no longer appeal, or where they do appeal, result in harm rather than good; and this because they are based on a wrong psychological method. Anatole France teaches this, only too well, in his terribly realistic *Thais*. Far-fetched appeals, and the descredited methods of frightening young people into self-control, are detestable. Moreover, the young people now recognise them as being so, and light-heartedly turn away.

This timely book should be read by all teachers and pastors. It is like a breath of fresh air in a charnel-house. J.C.H.

A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO CHURCH LAW.*

This excellently-arranged exposition of the legal rights and duties of the parochial clergy and the laity can be recommended to all for whose use it is designed. It aims at being a complete legal manual for the parish priest and the parochial lay officer, and admirably succeeds in fulfilling this ideal. The theological student who wishes to know the fees he will have to pay at his ordination, the organist who wishes to know who has the legal right to say whether he shall or shall not play the church organ, the sexton who wishes to know if he can be dismissed and by whom, the vicar who wishes to know on what terms he can redeem his tithe under the Act of 1918, will all find their questions answered for them within the pages of this book: and they, and all others seeking

**The Book of Church Law*, by the late J. H. Blunt, D.D., revised by G. Edwardes Jones. Eleventh edition, 1921, pp. xvi +592. Longmans Green & Co. 14s. net.

information from its pages will not have to spend more than a few seconds in finding the answers to their queries. A chapter has been added dealing with the formation of new parishes and the rights of curates-in-charge of mission districts, and a lengthy appendix contains the text of the most important Acts affecting the clergy, from the Canons of 1603 down to the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act of 1919. 'Heresy' is barely mentioned: but if we hear of any further delations we are confident that the next edition will contain a chapter dealing with the subject, so admirably does the book supply all practical needs. Lord Phillimore contributes a short preface, and his name and that of the learned reviser afford ample guarantee that the book is thoroughly sound from the legal point of view. C.J.

CORRESPONDENCE

REUNION AND PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

DEAR SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

I was interested in the article by Mr. Grubb in your last issue, but puzzled with its historical interpretation of the First Epistle of John. Undoubtedly Mr. Grubb has a right to question whether reunion will ever come about by a consideration of 'Faith' and 'Order,' and I think he is certainly right when he says, 'It is in the light of history that answers to these questions must be looked for. The real nature of the Church and of the Christianity that produced it will be best gathered if we look back to the first century, when both were at their purest and brightest.' But when he goes on to show, on an historical interpretation of the first Johannine Epistle, that the Christianity of the period had nothing to do with belief and organisation, I feel that we are not getting 'the light of history' referred to. It is disappointing too in view of what Mr. Grubb has previously published, for he has shown himself capable of historical research.

It seems to me that instead of an *historical* interpretation of this epistle, Mr. Grubb has given us a *textual* interpretation—he has resorted to the old methods of textual theology. Here, as in many cases of textual interpretation, the argument from silence is resorted to—because there is no mention of belief and organization there were none, or these things were not important. Using the same method of interpretation, it would be quite easy to show from the Ignatian Epistles—written some ten years later—that nothing *but* belief and organization mattered. Both conclusions are equally false, and false because they fail to take into account the historical situations which lie behind the writings under consideration. Mr. Grubb has treated the Johannine Epistle as absolute instead of related to the circumstances which called it forth, and thus I believe given us an interpretation of it far less true than that presented by Professor Bacon in his recent book on *Jesus and Paul.*

We may believe that reunion is to come apart from creed and organisation, but this does not warrant us finding confirmation for our views in an Epistle which was definitely written to refute gnostic heresies and received its ethical bias from the fact that one form of Gnosticism, which it had to refute, shewed itself in a contempt for the body which resulted in licentiousness of the worst kind. W. ROBINSON.

Overdale College, Moseley, Birmingham.

A LETTER FROM

Rev. Dr. R. F. HORTON, M.A.

to the EDITOR of

PUBLIC OPINION

The Rev. Dr. R. F. Horton, M.A., Minister of Lyndhurst Road Congregational Church, Hampstead, has sent the following letter to the Editor of "Public Opinion," and has given permission for its publication :—

Lyndhurst Road Church, Hampstead, N.W.3,
January 7, 1922.

To the Editor of "Public Opinion."

Dear Sir,—Real gratitude impels me to write. You sent me a copy of your paper some weeks ago. This led me to take it in. But I little thought what a boon was coming to me.

I cannot express strongly enough my admiration of the way in which the real thought of the week is collected, and put into a few pages. In vain one tries to read all papers and magazines, and consequently one's view of the world is always partial and imperfect. But you do in a way read all, and give your readers the result of a great achievement in diligent searching and observation.

I am recommending those whom I can influence to read your paper. It is the wholesomest and the widest thing I know in the modern Press. I dare say you have many acknowledgments as warm as mine—I hope you have—but I write, as I said, impelled by sheer gratitude.

Yours faithfully,
ROBERT F. HORTON.

"A WONDERFUL CURE FOR PESSIMISM"

The Rev. Dr. Horton, in his sermon at Hampstead, on New Year's Day, 1922, also said :—

"There is one little paper published which is a wonderful cure for the pessimism of our time. I refer to that little paper called 'Public Opinion.'

"It gathers together the opinions of the papers on many subjects every week, and it is astonishing, when you gather together the real thought of our time, to see how full of hope, how full of noble purpose, our country is, and it is astonishing to see how many noble things are said by almost all the papers in our country to-day.

"I think that if we could make it attractive, to recognise what is good and bring it out into clean line and detail, so that men might realise it, we should be doing a great deal for the betterment of the world."

THREEPENCE WEEKLY

A SPECIMEN COPY OF

PUBLIC OPINION

Edited by PERCY L. PARKER

will be sent to any address on receipt of a postcard addressed to the

MANAGER, "PUBLIC OPINION,"
20 LUDGATE HILL,
LONDON, E.C.4.

PUBLIC OPINION *can be sent post free to any address at home for* **17s. 4d.** *a year, or abroad for* **15s. 2d.** *a year.*

WHO BIDS FOR GOD'S OWN IMAGE?

Whittier.

You can save the life of a starving Russian for fifteen shillings!

Nineteen million people are on the brink of starvation. Half of this number will almost certainly die because it will not be possible to get help to them in time. But the rest **can** be saved if prompt action is taken.

COMMON HUMANITY and COMMON SENSE

dictate the wisdom of coming to the aid of these suffering peasants and thus preventing one of the most fertile countries in the world from becoming a desolate waste.

HOW MANY LIVES WILL YOU SAVE?

If these millions of lives are allowed to pass away, when by a slight concerted effort they could be saved, this generation will earn a reproach which history will not fail to record to our shame.

Send your subscriptions, clearly earmarked Friends' Relief Committee (for Russia), to Russian Famine Relief Fund, Room 56, General Buildings, Aldwych, London, W.C. 2.

Gifts in kind and clothing (new or partly worn) may be sent to the Warehouse, 5 New Street Hill, London, E.C. 4.

JANUARY No. 3s. 6d. net. 1922.

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL.

A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy.

EDITOR: L. P. JACKS, M.A., LL.D., D.D.

CONTENTS.

The Cambridge Conference of the Churchman's Union.
By the Rev. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D.
Modern Churchmen or Unitarians? By the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
The Modern Movement in the Church of England. By P. H. BAGENAL.
Columba. By LACHLAN M. WATT, D.D. Occultism. By EDWARD CLODD.
Materialism and Occultism. By E. WAKE COOK.
The Value of Plato's Laws To-Day. By Mrs. A. M. ADAM.
Logic and the Imagination. By LOUIS A. REID.
The Father or the State. By ANNA MARTIN.
The Gloom of Dean Inge. By the Rev. W. J. FERRAR.
The Nature of Man. By CASSIUS J. KEYSER, LL.D.
Education for Internationalism. By W. WATKIN DAVIES.
The Question of Responsibility. By H. C. SHAWCROSS.
Ode in a German Cemetery. By AMOS N. WILDER.
Discussions, Survey, and Signed Reviews.

JESUS OR CHRIST? Super royal 8vo. Cloth. 5s. net.

'Twelve years ago the Hibbert Trustees published a collection of Essays by representative writers belonging to various schools of thought under the title Jesus or Christ? . . . . the presentation in one volume of opinions so radically different, yet advocated by men who bore the Christian name, awakened the religious world to a fact which had not been recognized.'—Canon M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D., in CHRIST AND THE CREEDS.

The Essays were by Rev. G. Tyrell, Dr. E. G. Talbot, Professors H. Weimel, P. Gardner, P. W. Schmiedel, Henry Jones, N. Soderblom and B. W. Bacon, Rev. Richard Morris, Sir Oliver Lodge, Canon Scott Holland, Rev. Joseph Rickaby, Principal A. E. Garne, Dr. James Drummond, Principal J. E. Carpenter, James Collier and Rev. R. Roberts.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14 Henrietta Street, Covent Gardens, W.C. 2.

J. WIPPELL & Co., Ltd.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART WORKERS.	MAKERS OF CLERICAL OUTFIT.
EMBROIDERY, WOOD, STONE, METAL, AND STAINED GLASS.	CLOTHING, HATS, CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, ROBES, HOODS, STOLES, VESTMENTS, ETC.

EXETER 55 & 56, HIGH STREET, AND CATHEDRAL YARD; & 4 & 5, DUNCANNON ST., CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

CASTELL & SON.

(ESTABLISHED 1846).

Tailors, Robe Makers, and Clerical Outfitters.

13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

Representatives travel regularly and appointments are respectfully solicited.

Second and Revised Edition (largely re-written).

A Plea for the Thorough and Unbiassed Investigation of

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE. By C. H. LEA.

"A straightforward, reasoned defence and exposition of Christian Science methods. The author has proved to his own satisfaction that Christian Science is more reliable and satisfactory than ordinary medical methods; and gives as the fundamental basis of it the doctrine 'that God is perfection, and that all real and true life is a spiritual expression or manifestation of God, and therefore equally perfect.'"—*The Times.*

Christian Science accepts the recognized facts that God is Love, perfect, and infinite, and also recognizes that all teaching not in logical accord with those facts must be untrue. Therefore it is an invitation to other Churches to consider how far their teaching also is in logical accord with those facts, that all may work on the basis of absolute truth.

Christian Science further recognizes that God represents spiritual law, and that all trouble is due to men consciously or unconsciously thinking or acting contrary to spiritual law—God's perfect law of harmony, life, truth, and love.

Christian Science is a call to all men to seek first the Kingdom of God and to prove the truth of the reality of God and of the teaching of Christ Jesus in the every-day life of home and business.

Christian Science is a call to all men to seek and frankly acknowledge truth. One of the greatest needs of the world to-day is for teachers everywhere to have the moral courage to be absolutely honest in their search for and statement of truth.

Christian Science has proved and is continually proving that it is possible for every Christian not only to preach the Gospel but also to heal the sick and sinning.

Nearly 15,000 copies of the above book have been sold in England. Published by

J. M. DENT & SONS, Ltd., 11/13 Bedford Street, Strand, London, W.C.

To be obtained through all Booksellers and Bookstalls. Price 1/6 (cloth 3/-) net.

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by Bishop Boyd Carpenter, D.D., D.C.L., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919).

Warden—The Right Rev. H. M. Burge, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Principal—Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.

Vice-Principal—Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.

Chaplain—Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A.

Ripon Hall is a modern Theological College, designed for the training of Graduate candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese. Over one hundred and fifty of its students have so far been ordained. In conjunction with the Oxford University Ordination Course, with which it co-operates, it provides an interesting and many-sided curriculum.

Full particulars as to the Course, terms, fees, exhibitions, &c., can be had on application to the Principal.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall.